

FRANCE
UNDER THE REPUBLIC.

Acc. No.	22368.
Class No.	G. 30.
Book No.	9

PREFACE

THE writer has attempted in this book to gauge the great political experiment of France during the last four decades, and to make an inventory of the constructive and reformatory work of the Republic. That great evils exist to-day in Republican France is beyond question, but these evils are neither new nor exceptional with that country. Many of them were the blight of former régimes, and others belong to the times rather than to the land of Thiers and Gambetta. Some of these evils, also, are on the surface, or are, in part at least, imaginary. If we look beneath momentary disturbances, the strife of parties, the theatrical arraignment of opponents with an eye to the gallery, the controversies of extreme religious and irreligious men, we shall find innumerable evidences of a healthy progressive life. If we bear in mind the complexity of national problems and the difficulties thrown in the path of the French people — difficulties of history and religion which Americans have never experienced — we shall be filled with admiration for the Republicans

who, not without making many blunders, have, on the whole, wrought so well.

The writer assumes that the reader is acquainted with the sweeping criticisms of the Republic by its opponents, and these criticisms are seldom absolutely groundless. He has endeavoured to ascertain facts as they are, and to state them fairly. The contrast which he draws between the life of the Second Empire and that of the Republic does not deny a genuine progress in many things under Napoleon III; but taking conditions as they were then and as they are now, the present advance is evidently exceptional. As a Protestant, and satisfied, as such, with the treatment of Protestants by the government, he has endeavoured to set forth objectively the contentions between Catholics and Free-thinkers in the light of impartial law, which the former almost systematically oppose and the latter not infrequently disregard. In a period of transition and conflict, one cannot expect that consistency between principles and practice which can be attained in calmer times. In discussing the so-called religious issues of recent years the writer may unconsciously have departed a little from the judicial attitude which represents his ideal. It is difficult for a Frenchman, without a strong sense of indignation, to

see his native land disturbed by a small company of foreigners who, under the pretext of religion, are ever interfering with French affairs.

The first part of this book is devoted to a bird's-eye view of the great changes in the national life, while later chapters expand subjects already touched upon, but in view of recent events, not sufficiently discussed. Apart from a very extensive bibliography which he has used, the writer has drawn from his own experiences during the Second Empire, from his official relations with French societies, from his own residences in, and frequent visits to, the land of his birth. In some instances he can say with La Fontaine's pigeon, "*J'étais là; telle chose m'avint.*" His statistics come chiefly from official documents. *Le Temps*, *Le Siècle*, the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Rambaud's *Histoire de la civilisation contemporaine en France*, and from *The Statesman's Year Book*. The *Annuaire statistique* has been used constantly. It proved an inexhaustible mine of data, the value of which cannot be overrated. Its comparative array of facts constitutes one of the best demonstrations that can be made, of the progress of France under the Republic.

J. C. B.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE	v
I. THE WORK OF POLITICAL RECON- STRUCTION	1
II. THE TRANSFORMATION AND EX- PANSION OF FRANCE	30
III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE AND WEALTH	56
IV. THE NEW EDUCATION IN THE NEW LIFE	74
V. CHANGES IN LITERATURE, ART, AND PHILOSOPHY	91
VI. THE NEW ACTIVITY IN HISTORY AND SCIENCE	116
VII. SOCIAL REFORM AND PHILAN- THROPY	136
VIII. SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND MO- RALITY	156

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
IX. RELIGIOUS DOUBT AND RELIGION	174
X. THE CONTEMPORARY FRENCHMAN IN THE NEW LIFE	190
XI. MORAL INSTRUCTION IN FRENCH SCHOOLS	212
XII. EXTRACTS FROM TEXT-BOOKS OF MORAL INSTRUCTION USED IN FRENCH SCHOOLS	235
XIII. THE DISPERSION OF THE UN- AUTHORISED RELIGIOUS OR- DERS	252
XIV. THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE	280
XV. THE CRISIS OF THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE . . .	308
XVI. CONTEMPORARY FRENCH PROTES- TANTISM	333
INDEX	365

FRANCE
UNDER THE REPUBLIC

FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

CHAPTER I

THE WORK OF POLITICAL RECONSTRUCTION

THE difficulties which the Republic had to surmount in its early days were almost overwhelming. There were the twenty-six departments occupied by the Germans, and the Commune with its horrors, the disorganisation of public services, the lack of money, the indifference of the clergy to national ills and their clamours for a war with Italy, the petty intrigues of parties, each looking after its own interests, the prevailing mistrust — all this was more than sufficient to create a great national depression. Yet the people were far from disheartened. The Commune, that horrible misunderstanding — which impelled some men to take up arms for lofty social reasons, some for the defence of local liberties, and others from

sheer love of disorder — was put down with great severity, tempered later on with mercy.¹ By a superb outburst of patriotism, long to be remembered, the French people, after having faced burdensome financial obligations and paid two billion francs to Germany, at the appeal of M. Thiers for three more billions to settle the war indemnity, came forward with forty billions.² This enabled the provisional government, before the time appointed by the Treaty of Frankfort, to hasten the departure of German soldiers from France. No achievement of the Republic has ever received such co-operation of all classes and of all parties. The civil service, purged of many of the politicians of the Empire, was rapidly restored and efficiently reorganised, though it was impossible to eliminate from it that favouritism which has existed under all régimes.

The most difficult problem of all was to decide upon the character of the future institutions of the country. Various governments were possible. The Legitimists, posing as the makers of French history, sustained by the nobility as well

¹ Bourlouton et Robert, *La commune et ses idées à travers l'histoire*, Paris, 1872; Washburne, E. B., *Recollections of a Minister to France*, New York, 1887; Hanotaux, G., *Contemporary France*, New York, 1903, vol. I, p. 158.

² *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Aug. 1, 1872, p. 696; Le Goff, *The Life of Louis Adolphe Thiers*, New York, 1879, p. 241.

as by the clergy, had a fair political outlook, for they appealed to the religious and to the political traditions of the country. They would have succeeded had not the Comte de Chambord refused to accept the tricolour.¹ The Orleanists were not without encouraging prospects, for they represented a popular form of monarchy, friendly to the Church, to progress, and to modern culture. They held up before moderate Frenchmen the not distant possibility of a constitutional government like that of Great Britain, while the Comte de Paris, by his past history as well as by the signal beauty of his life, inspired the greatest sympathy. Moreover, his cause was sustained by men who were the most brilliant and popular opponents of the Empire in its last days. The Imperialists, on their side, could still depend upon all the beneficiaries of the previous rule, upon those who had held important sinecures, upon men with dictatorial instincts, and upon those who still idealised the military achievements of the first Napoleon. Masses of toilers still recalled the days of exceptional prosperity — not those of adversity — under a government which had led

¹ Hanotaux, G., *Contemporary France*, New York, 1903, vol. I, p. 256; Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 184.

4 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

France through the Crimean War, the War of Italy, the War of Mexico to Sedan. They remembered particularly the festivals, the brilliant pageants, but *not* the corrupt régime and its pitiful collapse. They would have been happy to try Napoleonic rule again.

The Republicans had a decidedly inauspicious outlook. They stood before the public as the political visionaries and utopians of the land. Their principles seemed particularly idealistic and fanciful to those who posed as practical men. Their conception of government was repugnant to the conservative masses, who were essentially hostile to the idea of political progress. Their aspirations ran full tilt against the ideals of the Catholic Church. The horrors of the French Revolution — not its beneficent effects — were still associated in the Catholic mind with Republican régime, while the blunders of the Republic of 1848 seemed to many inseparable from Republican rule. The upholders of democratic ideals were maliciously made responsible for the Commune, and represented as leaning toward socialism, then the terror of all respectable Frenchmen. In such circumstances, a republic seemed but a distant possibility. Yet this was the government imposed upon the nation, not by a deliberate

choice, but by a hard, harsh necessity.¹ A republic had, at least, theoretic chances of stability for which the people greatly longed, while the triumph of the Monarchists would have doomed the country to an endless series of disturbances and revolutions. Again, any one of the three other parties, raised to power, would have removed all hopes from the opposition, while the Republic — for awhile at least — kept them alive. Multitudes rallied to this political experiment, without any enthusiasm, with the feeling that it was the only possible peaceful government, and the one they wanted.

A good constitution — not the wisest that could be conceived but the best one for France, adapted to national needs, and capable of subsequent readjustments — was framed. It was not a high-sounding decalogue like most of its predecessors, but one susceptible of modifications which experience might suggest. The slight changes introduced into it, in 1875, 1884, 1885, and 1889, tend to show the wisdom of those who framed it. No country has elected its presidents more easily, more rapidly, or, as a

¹ It is said that, on the evening when the National Assembly accepted the republican form of government, the wife of the president, McMahon, said to some one sitting near her at dinner: "At last we have it, that rascally Republic." (Avenel, *Les Français de mon temps*, p. 20.)

whole, more successfully. The method of election provided by the constitution has proven a superb instrument of selection. Thiers, McMahon, Grévy, Carnot, Faure, Casimir-Périer, Loubet, and Fallières constitute a line of presidents of a fairly large mental calibre, of great dignity of life and efficiency. Without being blind to some of their limitations, where is the land whose chief magistrates during the same period would offer a finer record? So real have been the services rendered by them that no one now, as in the early days of the Republic, speaks of abolishing the office of president.

In the executive machinery also a great change has taken place. Several ministers have been added to those already existing. Agriculture, the colonies, and labour came to have their distinct places in the administration of the country. The efficiency of the ministries has been increased by the gradual introduction of under secretaries of state, and by the co-operation of elected superior councils whose members are men of special competence chosen by their peers. When this was done for education, Jules Ferry rightly said that that ministry had ceased to be an administration, "to become an organised and living body."¹ The ministries are not

¹ Rambaud, A., *Jules Ferry*, Paris, 1903, p. 102.

simply executive, but also agencies carrying on extensive investigations and studies upon innumerable subjects affecting the national works and policies in many directions. The cabinets may change, but the regular officials of the ministries seldom do.

It is owing to this that one sees designs planned and carried out with remarkable continuity of purpose. The gradual control of North Africa by France is a notable illustration of this. The steady diplomatic policy since 1887 is another. Many other instances might be adduced to show the working of the permanent and unchangeable elements in the ministries. The cabinets, until recent years, were short-lived, and that was ascribed to French fickleness; but critics failed to recall that the ministries were not constituted so much in view of longevity as of national security. French legislators wished to avoid the repetition of Napoleonic dictatorship and of *coups-d'état*. Even from the point of view of duration there is progress. While there were fifteen different ministries during the first decade of the Republic, there have been only five during the last ten years. This increasing permanence of cabinets has often been secured at the cost of the favours of ministers to deputies who endeavour to obtain

offices for their constituents; but even at this point the spoils system has never gone to the extreme which it has attained in some other countries. The wonder is that, with a system whereby a majority against one single proposal of a minister entails the overthrow of a whole cabinet, ministerial changes should not have been more numerous.

The Senate is perhaps the most perfect work of the Republic. It has had among its members scientists like Wurtz, Berthelot, Broca; philosophers like Littré and Jules Simon; literary men like Scherer and Deschanel père; religious men like Dupanloup and Edmond de Pressensé; royal spirits representing all shades of political opinions, Laboulaye, Challemel-Lacour, d'Audiffret-Pasquier, Jauréguiberry, Haussonville père, and Grévy. It contains now the flower of French political intelligence. We see at its sessions de Freycinet, Bérenger, de Mercère, de Lamazelle, de Courcel, Delpech, Dupuy (Ch.), Mézières, Clemenceau, Méline, Combes, Ribot, Siegfried, Rouvier, Ranc, Lintillac, Lozé, d'Estournelles de Constant, Ph. Berger, and Trouillot. It would be difficult to find another upper house in the world representing so much personal and political worth.

In the intention of its founders the Senate was,

above all, to be a conservative institution. Gambetta, who, like most of his followers, opposed it at the outset, came to recognise its importance; then he spoke of it as "the Great Council of the Towns of France," a necessary check upon the Chamber of Deputies, the organ of French democracy as organised in cities.¹ At first it owed its superiority to the fact that its members might be selected by the government from among the most distinguished sons of France, outside of the political machinery. Now it has the signal advantage of drawing its members mostly from the deputies. The elected are better senators because they have been deputies, and often because they have been good deputies. The experience gained in the popular Chamber brings its best fruition in the Senate. Deputies are naturally drawn to the Luxembourg by the longer term of office, nine years instead of four, by the greater independence which they enjoy from their constituents, by the more dignified function and the greater honour. Senators are more carefully chosen than any other French representatives and by a smaller, more intelligent and select electorate. Thus of the following senators sent to the two houses, Méline had 8,238 votes as a deputy and 659 as a senator;

¹ Adam, Mme. Ed., *Nos amitiés politiques*, Paris, 1908, p. 244.

10 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

Francis Charmes was sent to the Palais-Bourbon with 4,171 votes and to the Luxembourg with 288; Charles Dupuy was made deputy by 10,201 votes and senator by 480.¹ The Senate has been all along an intelligent moderating and controlling power, often preventing hasty and unwise legislation. The slow ascent of its members from the Chamber of Deputies helps to create a homogeneity in Parliament which could not exist otherwise. It tends to eliminate the former aristocrats and the ultra conservatives on behalf of more democratic and progressive elements.

The Chamber of Deputies has often voiced the political effervescence of the land and reflected the spirit of its politicians. It has demagogues, radical demagogues and clerical demagogues, but judged by its best it would still bear a favourable comparison with any popular House of Representatives on the Continent. It suffers unquestionably from the elimination of its ablest members through their promotion to the Senate, but the new men are in closer touch with national feelings, more alert and earnest. They are less likely to become fossilised. Many of the disturbances of this house have been due

¹ Ribeyre, F., *La nouvelle chambre*, 1889-1893; Grenier, A. S., *Nos sénateurs*, 1906-1909.

to the parliamentary inexperience of the country. When the National Assembly gathered at Bordeaux, in 1871, there were distinguished men in its midst, such as the Duc d'Aumale, Thiers, Bishop Dupanloup, Prince de Joinville, General Chanzy, General Changarnier, Jules Simon, Léon Say, Gambetta, de Broglie, and Jules Favre — uncommon men, but as a whole not yielding the elements of a good national representation. Most of them were royalists incapable of reading aright the wants of the French nation. The Assembly was really composed of men unknown to one another and hardly acquainted with the real needs of France.¹ Contentions without number have arisen because of the dual spirit of the members of Parliament, some representing the old spirit of the Church and the privileges of aristocracy, while the others were upholders of absolute political equality.

One other reason for the frequent turmoils in this house is that French legislators have a far more difficult task to perform than the legislators of the United States because they have to deal with questions which, in this country, are settled by the States. The commotions in the lower house are also occasioned by the importance of the issue discussed. Since the con-

¹ Scheurer-Kestner, *Souvenirs de jeunesse*, 1905, p. 241.

12 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

tentions over slavery, in the legislative halls of the United States, no such burning question have been before American legislators as that of the secularisation of French schools, the dispersion of the unauthorised orders, and the separation of Church and State.

It should also be remembered that, as the Chamber of Deputies has the initiative in the matter of new laws, these are presented in a rough and indefinite form which is likely to excite bitter antagonism. Furthermore, the majority of deputies have the restlessness of progressive men. The so-called unruly elements have been those which have forced the Parliament to devise and to do. As a whole, the Senate has represented a wise conservatism, not unfriendly to change; and the lower house, a fearless, if at times impatient, spirit of progress. The Senate is still, at least in part, inspired by the political liberalism of the French Revolution, but the House of Deputies has directed its efforts toward social legislation, and endeavoured to remove some of the traditional injustice in contemporary society. The deputies have their unworthy members, but as a whole they do not deserve the sweeping denunciations of their enemies. The charge made against them that they are hostile to religion and bitter against religious

ideas, may be applied to only a few of the members. M. Paul Sabatier mentions religious speeches made before the deputies and listened to with perfect courtesy.¹ The interesting but long religious discourses of M. Eugène Réveillaud during the discussion of the Law of Separation would not have been heard so respectfully by American congressmen as they were by French deputies.² As to those who have systematically opposed both houses, it is difficult to speak with much praise. They have all along betrayed the cause of true conservatism by a tactless opposition. They have never known how to defend their interests properly by making needful concessions to rising democracy. They have often joined their own bitterest enemies to overthrow a moderate cabinet, bringing thereby to power those from whom they had most to fear. Comte Georges d'Avenel, a distinguished member of the French nobility, does not hesitate to recognise this fact.³

The general councils (*conseils-généraux*), or department assemblies, mere shams of local government under the Empire, have, with the Republic, become efficient instruments of provin-

¹ *Lettre ouverte à S. E. Cardinal Gibbons*, pp. 38 and 39.

² Réveillaud, E., *La séparation des églises de l'état*, Paris, 1901, pp. 239, 324 and 396.

³ *Les Français de mon temps*, Paris, 1904, p. 41.

14 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

cial service and of decentralisation. Apart from their functions, which are constantly extended by new prerogatives, these councils have often voiced local feelings in such a manner and so concurrently with the Parliament as to leave no doubt as to the real state of the national mind upon any policy. Through these councils local interests have an organ of representation, and local ideas a voice, heard by the nation when necessary. Though vexatious at times, the prefect is no longer the imperial satrap of Napoleon, before whom every one trembled. When he exceeds his rights, the representatives of local authority — now there is a local independent authority — do not hesitate to remind him of it, or to have the matter brought before the Parliament. The prefect is still the representative of the central government, and, as a rule, a courteous and correct official. With the exception of Paris, which, like Washington, has a communalistic régime of its own, all municipalities are absolutely free in the choice of mayor, as well as in that of the members of their municipal councils. The towns have never had so much local government, and never have they devised more measures of local utility. With this has come a new municipal spirit of reform, progress, and enterprise. The writer could mention cities

and villages, the progress of which reminds him of the advance of American communities.

One great change which has taken place is that the people are not at the mercy of public officials as under the Second Empire. There is nothing left of that awful *loi de sureté générale*, whereby one could be arrested, exiled to other countries, sent to deadly penal colonies without any form of trial.¹ Imperfect as the judiciary is, exceptionally, at times, there is no such parody of justice as the famous *Procès des Treize*, when the imperial government had thirteen liberals condemned under the most futile pretexts.² Similarly has disappeared the *Cabinet noir*, in which the correspondence of suspected citizens could be, and was, examined by the government.³

All the changes which we have sketched have been encouraged and upheld by the suffrage of the nation, which has never been so free or so intelligent. Frenchmen in office, whether in politics or in the Church, have always used their influence at the ballot-box on behalf of their friends — they still do, and often with detesta-

¹ Rambaud, *Histoire de la civilisation contemporaine en France*, Paris, 1901, p. 520; Scheurer-Kestner, *Souvenirs de jeunesse*, p. 101; Léon Séché, *Jules Simon*, Paris, 1905, p. 74; Adam, Mme. Ed., *Nos amitiés politiques*, p. 8.

² Rambaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 9.

³ Scheurer-Kestner, *Mes souvenirs*, pp. 110, 115 and 117; Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire universel*, vol. XVI.

ble methods — but the fact remains that the individual voter has never been so independent. Those who have known the *candidatures officielles* of Napoleon III smile when they hear the impeachment of the Republican elections in which there is much indeed to condemn. Then, representatives of employers would visit the workingmen and practically give them orders to vote for the candidate patronised by the firm. Now, the workingman may be bidden by labour unions — these labour unions affect only a limited number of voters — to sustain some favourites. The beneficiary of the government does what he can to influence votes. The administration helps its favoured candidates, but the fact remains that the voter, even so, can dispose of his ballot more freely than ever before.

The idea of liberty for all free French citizens, which was opposed at every step by the Empire, has carried the day. This is evident if we consider four highly important laws conceding new liberties. There is the law of June 10, 1881, granting freedom to hold meetings; that of July 31, 1881, sanctioning the freedom of the press; that of March 21, 1884, allowing the organisation of trades-unions and of various labour societies, and that of July 1, 1901, conceding freedom to organise corporations and

associations. It may be asserted that as a whole the Republicans, in the midst of men systematically opposed to their ideals, have endeavoured to secure for the greatest *possible number* of citizens a maximum of liberty and justice. In so doing conflicts have come. No live nation can advance without them, but in the struggles for better things these conflicts have scarcely interfered with good civil service and progressive life. Mr. Bodley, an English gentleman ever unfriendly to the Republic, was obliged to recognise its good government. "I would be perplexed," he says, "to mention three nations which on the whole are better governed than France."¹

The increase of freedom for individuals has been, as just noted, extended to organisations. So great were the obstacles placed in their way, even during the last days of the Empire, that it was difficult to create any form of association, or to keep it alive. The consequence was that societies were few. Foreign ethnographers had noticed this, and ascribed it to racial traits—racial traits at that time explained everything. With the freedom of the Republic associations of all kinds sprang up in every direction. A little city which had two or three societies will

¹ *France*, New York, 1898, vol. I, p. 44.

18 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

now count them by the score. Commercial companies rose from 3,983 in 1871 to 5,814 in 1904; trades-unions from 175 in 1884 to 11,841 in 1906;¹ mutual benefit societies from 4,237 in 1872 to over 10,000 in 1904.² Co-operative societies have increased in membership thirty-six times from 1870 to 1899. This union and socialisation of efforts has shown itself in a multitude of religious works, of philosophical, scientific, philanthropic, and artistic associations. As soon as Frenchmen were able they took advantage of their freedom to organise associations so essential to progress. This associational movement is not without its dangers. The rise of great organisations will doubtless create frequent conflicts with the State, but national security will be found in the principles of political equality, which are sinking profoundly into the national consciousness. Be that as it may, it is strange to find that, at the beginning of this twentieth century, the old Napoleonic law of 1810, that no more than twenty persons could meet together without the permission of the government, was still on the statute book. This legal landmark of former despotism had been subjected to the attacks of liberals from the days of

¹ *Annuaire statistique*, 1906.

² *Journal des Débats*, April 15, 1904.

Louis Philippe to our own. In 1901, Waldeck-Rousseau put an end to that anachronism. Freedom of association was fully granted to all groups of citizens, but not to unauthorised religious orders which, with the various monastic associations, had been so constant in their opposition to popular liberty.

It is probable that at no distant period even these restraints upon the orders will be removed. By the separation of Church and State, the country has also been freed from one of the most despotic political rules to which the clergy of the land were ever subjected, the Concordat. Whatever one may think of the manner in which it was abrogated, there can be no doubt as to the tyrannical character of that celebrated document, and of the Organic Articles that went with it, both of which were long and fully accepted by the Church. Now, Catholic priests, as far as the government is concerned, are liberated from all the restraints of bygone days. Religious bodies, persecuted under the Empire, now enjoy the greatest liberty. Baptists, Methodists, Theosophists, Buddhists, and Comtists have the right to preach and practise their peculiar tenets like Catholics, under the *droit commun*.

The development of the press, more than any-

thing else, perhaps, enables us to gauge the extension of liberty. The harassed journalism of the Second Empire, daily exposed to ruinous fines, to the incarceration of the editor, seems to belong to another age than ours. Ranc was condemned to four months' imprisonment for an article not half so violent as those of the opposition to-day.¹ The manager or the printer of a paper could be arrested with the editor. The paper might be suppressed, thereby bringing about the bankruptcy of the owner. An internal revenue tax was collected upon each number of any paper issued. All this has been replaced by a thoroughly independent and often extremely reckless press. Through the sudden extension of liberty, whereby those who accuse the Republic of tyranny can assail it ceaselessly in their papers, the expansion of journalism has been rapid, not to say extraordinary. At the close of the Second Empire Paris had only twenty dailies, and their circulation was small. Even the *Petit Journal* had an issue of not more than sixty thousand. In 1898 the Parisian dailies had risen in number to one hundred and ten. The circulation of the *Petit Journal* has long ago passed the million mark, while some of its contemporaries have attained a correspond-

¹ Adam, Mme. Ed., *Nos amitiés politiques*, p. 8.

ing increase. The number of dailies for the whole country has risen from forty-eight to three hundred and eighty in twenty-eight years. The total number of newspapers and other periodicals throughout France, which, in 1870, was exceedingly small, rose in 1880 to 2,980, in 1899 to 6,736,¹ and in 1908 to 9,877.²

The same freedom has been extended to literature. The Republic, for good or evil, has abolished the censure of literary and especially of dramatic works, assuming that the best censor, in this domain, is public opinion. The imperial laws, preventing the unfettered peddling of books, of pamphlets, of papers and pictures, were repealed; and the new statutes, as far as this domain is concerned, apply only to pornographic works.

The same generalising of freedom has been applied to the opening of saloons, and that with unfortunate results. A great change has also taken place in reference to travel and residence. Formerly there was a real inquisitorial system. Travellers were subjected to numerous formalities more or less vexatious, and even to the surveillance of spies in hotels. Any citizen travelling at a distance of fifteen or twenty miles from

¹ Avenel, H., *Annuaire de la presse*.

² *Annuaire de la presse française*, 1909.

home was expected to carry papers, a labourer to have his *livret*.¹ The poor workingman was often prohibited from going to Paris or to other large centres to earn his livelihood, but now all may go with the utmost freedom, and without annoyance, wherever they wish. Travel and transportation have been released from the irritating control of papers and passports. The new spirit has broken through the national exclusiveness, and foreigners may be naturalised more readily than before.

Nothing can give a better idea of the work of the Republic than the general trend of legislation. Something has been done — much more remains to be done — to free the child from absolute paternal authority which is still the survival of Roman law. The former power of parents to prevent the marriage of their children has been greatly restricted, and that with good results. The French code now allows the judiciary to take away children from the care of vicious parents. The legal status of woman has been raised. Women at the head of commercial houses, or of large industrial pursuits, have the right to vote at elections for judges of

— Book of identity delivered by the authorities to the workingman, without which he could not secure any labour. The Republic has done away with it.

the tribunal of commerce; they may be witnesses in matters of deeds or other legal documents; they may study and practise law, or devote themselves to any science or art. The legal and social progress has been such that a woman, Mme. Curie, has become a professor of science at the Sorbonne and occupies one of the foremost chairs of French higher education. A law was passed in 1891 securing to the wife a more equitable share in the succession of her deceased husband. Another law has been passed that secures to a married woman her wages, which previously could be collected by her husband, even when he had deserted his home. In the case of intolerable marriage situations, the law has provided the, however unsatisfactory, at times necessary, remedy of divorce.

The statute book now contains provisions for the greater protection of the accused before French courts. They are no longer considered guilty until they have proven their innocence. They may have legal counsel immediately after their arrest; and even in civil cases, if one of the parties is too poor, the State comes to his rescue and furnishes a competent lawyer. The accused in a criminal case is no longer obliged to stay in prison awaiting the good pleasure of the judge; but if his case is not ready, he may

have conditional freedom. A new law, now before the Senate, guarantees the inviolability of the home and of the correspondence of the accused. The Parliament is now endeavouring to transfer to the civil courts, in time of peace, the military cases which hitherto have been decided by martial courts.

The tendency has been to bring all misdemeanours exclusively before the judiciary, and to assert the absolute independence of the bench from the executive. The Dreyfus case, when France was divided into two camps, each having upon its flag, *Fiat justitia*, whatever else it showed, showed also how, in different ways and at any cost, both wanted justice, both were ready to sacrifice for justice even national peace. Laws also have simplified the revision of criminal cases, rendering it both easier and quicker.

The fundamental principle of law-making has been reversed. Thus, in attempting to solve problems, and especially labour problems, Napoleon III proceeded by notions of abstract justice, rather than by rules of equity growing out of concrete cases. The laws of the Republic have been empirical, even endeavouring to eliminate wrongs in conditions. The aim has not been so much to punish as to prevent wrong; it has not been individualism but solidarity.

The national jurisprudence has been liberalised and humanised. The celebrated Bérenger Law is a law of probation, which interests a culprit in his own moral regeneration. Incarceration before a trial must now be reckoned as a part of the total penalty. Imprisonment for debt has been abolished. The Republic has not only made a great advance in the nobler and more dignified administration of justice, but in seeking for absolute justice itself. Thus the man who has atoned for his guilt cannot be punished further by calling him an "ex-convict." In the scales of French justice those who have endured the penalty of the law cannot be pursued further through life by a relentless social Nemesis. Nature is merciless, but justice, which rises above nature, must be a barrier against social vengeance.

If we turn from the consideration of the features of a great internal change to that of the adaptation of the Republic to her international environments, we shall be impressed by the progress made. In the last days of the Second Empire, France had been isolated by the meddlesome and tactless policy of the emperor. He gained nothing from England by his participation in the Crimean War, while he irritated Russia for years to come. He aroused the feelings of the American people by the campaign of

Mexico, as well as by his open sympathy for the South during the Rebellion. He excited the resentment of Austrians by the war of Italy, without winning the gratitude of Italians; for while he helped them to secure their unity, he constituted himself the custodian of the last remnant of the temporal power of the Pope. Had the son of Hortense been willing to have French soldiers leave Rome, on the eve of the Franco-Prussian War, Austria and Italy would have joined France against Germany in 1870. In the great conflict France was thoroughly isolated, and the moral sentiment of the whole world was against her in just condemnation of the war, now known to have been brought about by Bismarck, whose supreme art was to provoke it and cause Napoleon to appear as the aggressor. This war was virtually continued by the Iron Chancellor, who organised the Triple Alliance to isolate France, while another triple alliance had been made between England, Italy, and Spain to check French action in the Mediterranean.¹ The attitude of Bismarck, alarmed at the rapid recuperation of the country, came near bringing about a new conflict which was averted, thanks to the good offices of St. Petersburg and of London.

¹ Bérard, V., *La France et Guillaume II*, 1907, p. 22.

The place which France had lost in international life has been more than regained. The labours of M. Delcassé were of signal value in the improvement of French external relations. He was a leader in the peace policy of Europe. He did not wait until all the powers were compelled to move by the irresistible behests of the conscience of the civilised world. At the time of Fashoda, he urged arbitration upon the points at issue; and even when this was refused by England, he still showed the most conciliatory attitude. From this policy he never deviated. He was foremost in signing treaties of arbitration, and in putting an end to Anglo-French controversies. The settlement of the Newfoundland difficulty was due, in a very large measure, to his far-sighted and conciliatory spirit. He brought Great Britain to make the neutrality of the Suez Canal real, while the Egyptian question ceased to be a constant cause of Anglo-French friction. The Republic had already brought about the Russian Alliance, but he created the Anglo-French *entente*, followed by the Franco-Italian and the Franco-Spanish agreements equally commendable. An enumeration of his successful diplomatic acts with almost all the other powers would be as flattering to the great minister as it would be fatiguing

to the reader. He did not plan the isolation of Germany in Europe, "he worked against no one." He prepared the pacific solution of the Moroccan problem, which cost him his portfolio, as the Rouvier Cabinet sacrificed him to placate Germany. If the Kaiser endeavoured to prevent the carrying out of the Delcasséan plans, the powers, at Algeciras, gave a virtual sanction to them. In any case, there could not have been a more flattering manifestation of the good-will of all the powers but two than that which was given at that conference. They were all aware that there is a radical difference between the ideals of humanitarian solidarity of the Republic and the racial exclusivism of the German Empire.

Since that time M. Pichon has only continued the policy of M. Delcassé. He has brought about a Russo-Japanese reconciliation, reached a new understanding with Spain in reference to the Mediterranean and North Africa, made an agreement with Japan shielding French Asiatic possessions, contributed to the better relations of Russia and England, and, on February 9, 1909, signed an important agreement with Germany in reference to Morocco. In dealing with world-problems, France took a most active part at the Conference of Brussels, in 1874, at

that of Berlin in 1885, and at those of The Hague in 1899 and in 1907. She inaugurated the era of international congresses, as essential parts of expositions, at her World's Fair in 1889, and has been largely represented in those which have taken place on such occasions elsewhere. International congresses, upon all great issues of our times, have not only been instruments of international friendliness and peace, but they have been a great educative force, bringing into French life the experience of man from all parts of the world. The influence of these gatherings has been intensified by the many international societies¹ which the larger life of the Republic has fostered. Never have French diplomatic relations been more satisfactory or French life more in touch with all great human interests beyond national borders.

¹ Fifteen of them have their headquarters in France.

CHAPTER II

THE TRANSFORMATION AND EXPANSION OF FRANCE

THE nation has also made great sacrifices to improve her capacity for resistance and her power of expansion. The army, which was disorganised, not to say demoralised by the misfortunes of the Franco-Prussian War, has been remodelled. Whatever may be the present limitations of French officers, there is an essential difference between them and those of the Empire. An officer of the staff of General Félix Douai asked at Mülhausen, in 1870, if the Harth was broad and had a bridge over it, taking that forest for a river; and General Michel telegraphed the Minister of War to ascertain where his own troops were.¹ The officers of to-day have worked much, and from a technical point of view are superior to all their predecessors. Taken all and all, the same thing might be said of their manliness and devotion

¹ Scheurer-Kestner, *Souvenirs de jeunesse*, p. 160.

to their country. The corruption revealed at the time of the Dreyfus case was connected with the Bureau of Military Information, in which a man to excel is tempted to trample under foot the moral principles everywhere upheld by true men. The army is now like the nation. It is no longer made up of the poor, the ignorant, or paid substitutes. The *marchands d'hommes*, who made it their business to provide some one to take the place of the rich, disappeared with the Empire. The son of a peasant and the son of a duke now stand side by side in the ranks. There wealth and birth no longer create much inequality, though the officers come mostly from aristocratic families; but the middle class is more and more taking an important place among them.

The term of military service has been reduced from seven years to two years. The peace footing of the army has risen from 400,000 to 571,000, and the war contingent from 540,000 to 4,350,000.¹ As Captain Lebaud has said: "The conception of the army has changed. It is no longer intended for the purpose of conquering new territories, but to safeguard the national honour. The soldier to-day is a free and conscious citizen who is entitled to some considera-

¹ Rambaud, *op. cit.*, p. 569.

tion.”¹ The army is fast becoming something more than a fighting machine. The officer is more than a commander, he is rapidly becoming an educator. In many places he has opened schools which have been quite successful. In the opinion of Captain Lebaud, the residence in barracks now should build up manhood rather than mere technical ability. Good appearance should be an index of self-control and self-restraint. Hazing has almost disappeared. The attacks of French pacifists upon the army have contributed much to its transformation. There can be no question that it brings Frenchmen of different provinces together, introduces a common national spirit among men who have never been assimilated,² leads them to speak the national vernacular of which they have been ignorant, while it imparts to them a discipline which, later on, may be secured outside of the army. In Madagascar it has become a great force of colonial pioneering and of instruction in the arts of peace. The soldiers have been made overseers, gardeners, farmers, road builders, engineers, etc.³ The same thing is true of the recent campaign in Morocco. They built roads, con-

¹ *L'Education dans l'armée d'une démocratie*, p. 55.

² This is the case with the Basques, the Bretons, and the Flemish.

³ Gallieni, *La pacification de Madagascar*, 1900.

structed bridges, opened markets, established a postal and telegraph service, dispensaries, etc. Many of the leaders became explorers, such as Gallieni, Gentil, Mizon, Binger, Toutée, and Lamy. One cannot but gratefully record what French troops have done under the Republic to deliver Africa from the black Caligulas, Samory, Behanzin, and Rabat, whose records of cruelty surpass the darkest feats which the most sanguinary imagination could picture. It would be an act of signal injustice not to mention the great services rendered everywhere to science by French officers.

The navy, so powerless during the Franco-Prussian War, has become in Europe second only to that of Great Britain.² The recent criticisms of the navy, though containing some truth, do not as yet change the relative naval strength of the country. That the British should have an admirable navy is quite natural. The whole British people have an irresistible love of the sea and of ocean travel. They are the nomads of the deep. The French are much more attached to the soil. With the exception of those living along the coasts, they have none of the

¹ *Le Siècle*, Jan. 23, 1909.

² This statement, true when written, will have ceased to be so when the naval units which Germany is building are completed.

34 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

instincts of a maritime people. To develop qualities of seamanship the government has given extensive bounties to fishermen, most of whom, in time of war, would be available for service in the navy. The existence of a large fleet cultivates the habit of life on the ocean which not infrequently becomes love of the sea. In this respect there has been a change in the feelings of Frenchmen. Nothing is more interesting than the poetic effusions of Richepin, a man who had stood before the mast, upon the beauties of the ocean and the glories of the deep. This modification of the French attitude toward sea-faring life is a factor of no little moment in reckoning the naval strength of France. We might apply to the navy the remarks made about the army, that, apart from the sense of security which it gives to the nation, it exerts considerable influence upon the populations coming into touch with it, and remains a necessity so long as the French flag floats over so many lands and all the great nations keep up their burdensome naval armaments.

The colonies and protectorates of France have increased eight times in extent. During the Republic has come the idea of a greater France through her union with her most important colonies. Like Russia she has her most prom-

ising colonies at her door. One by one African possessions have been added by arrangements with the powers until the French flag flies over territories extending, with the omission of the Mediterranean, from the British channel to the Congo River. These acquisitions and groupings have been carried on with a continuity of purpose which is truly admirable. There is a scheme to unite more efficiently these possessions by a railroad extending from Algiers to Lake Tchad. Railroads have been built in Dahomey, Senegal, Algeria, and Tunis. Though this last province has been less than thirty years under French rule, it possesses as many kilometres of railroad in proportion to its population as France itself. The contracted railroads, those in process of construction and those in running order, for the province are 2,040 kilometres.¹ The Trans-Soudanais, uniting Senegal and the Niger Valley, will, when completed, have a length of 2,700 kilometres; an important part of it is already finished and prosperous.² The Guinea Railroad was finished to the four hundredth kilometre, August 30, 1909.³ The great and most difficult railroad from the eastern coast of Madagascar to the heights of Antananarivo is completed

¹ *L'Illustration*, April 16, 1910.

² *Le Temps*, Sept. 3, 1909.

³ *Ibid.*, Sept. 21, 1909.

from the ocean to the former capital of the island. Timbuctoo, the city which had remained so long an agglomeration of men the farthest removed from all possible Western influence, is a well-governed French possession. Caravans now go from there without difficulty to the most northerly points of Africa. A great work of the French has been the digging of thousands of artesian wells which bring fertility as soon as they are dug, while much has been done otherwise for irrigation.

The capital invested in French colonies, so insignificant under the Empire, is now estimated at over 4,000,000,000 francs; and the colonial trade, so unimportant in 1870 that the *Statesman's Year Book* does not record it, is now, including that of Tunis and Algeria, 1,400,000,000 francs annually.¹ The old colonies, such as St. Pierre and Miquelon, Guadeloupe, Martinique, and Réunion, are not financially profitable, but those which came under the French flag during the second half of the nineteenth century are quite prosperous. From 1889 to 1905 the trade of Algeria has increased from 87,984,000 francs to 124,950,000, that of Tunis from 48,188,000 francs to 158,000,000, that of Senegal from 38,746,000 to 77,879,000, that of the French Congo from

¹ *Le Signal*, Aug. 20, 1907.

6,221,000 to 24,312,000, that of Indo-China from 118,249,000 to 423,318,000, that of New Caledonia from 15,736,000 to 21,797,000; from 1892 to 1905 that of Madagascar passed from 8,003,000 to 54,049,000, that of Guinea from 7,622,000 to 35,299,000, that of the Ivory Coast from 5,719,000 to 21,531,000, that of Dahomey from 13,693,000 to 18,367,000, that of Mayotte from 1,962,000 to 3,869,000; from 1899 to 1905 that of the French Somali Coast rose from 1,962,000 to 30,149,000.¹ The colonial finances have been so administered that many colonies have a surplus in their budget.

To defend these possessions a colonial army has been created. While many natives have been incorporated in it, their education has not been neglected. The budget for education for French western Africa has risen from 241,909 francs in 1883 to 1,115,990 francs in 1909. In Algeria were created *Medersas*, or training schools for the Islamitic clergy, who thereby become more intelligent and more liberal. Schools were opened also by Jules Ferry with the thought of educating the natives to render them capable of fully enjoying the rights of citizenship. If these people at times have been molested, as a rule the government has protected them against

¹ *Annuaire statistique*, 1906.

the greed of European settlers — French as well as others. M. Etienne said in Parliament, some years ago, that in Algeria, after so many years of French occupation, the natives still held twelve-thirteenths of the land, which they are fast improving. Following the methods of their conquerors, their farming has been modified so that, where they reaped only four quintals of wheat per hectare, now the yield is nine quintals.¹ Agriculture has become diversified. Large vineyards have been established, olive-tree plantations have been made on a large scale, the gathering of cork has assumed some importance, and truck farms send their early vegetables to Europe. The mines yield now fifty millions of francs a year. All the great instruments of civilisation have been introduced. Mr. James F. J. Archibald, the war correspondent, speaks of “the truly marvellous work the French Government has done in Algeria in the past sixty years, and in Tunis during the last twenty years.”² Those who are acquainted with the colonial history of the world and of black France will be pleased to hear the same gentleman say: “Not until I visited the French colonies of northern Africa did I find what I considered a most perfect form of colo-

¹ *Le Temps*, June 1, 1909.

² *The National Geographical Magazine*, March, 1909.

nisation, and I now firmly believe that the French people and the French Government are to-day the most practical colonisers of the civilised world.”

The experiences in the colonies have reacted upon the education of the mother country. The general abstract conception of man has been modified by coming in contact with other races. A colonial literature has come into existence describing the homes of Frenchmen beyond the sea, or the tragedies springing from the contact of the colonists with the natives. In 1909 was founded *La Société coloniale des artistes français*, devoting itself to colonial themes, showing the artistic possibilities of new lands under new conditions. Colonial schools, colonial gardens, and colonial experimental stations have exerted considerable influence. *Le Jardin colonial* has studied the best species of cacao-trees, of sugar-canes, of gutta-percha and rubber plants for colonies. It has made special studies of all forms of colonial produce, thereby incidentally rendering services to botany. An institute of colonial medicine studies all the diseases of foreign possessions. Societies, such as the *Union coloniale*, *La Colonisation française*, *La Mutualité coloniale*, and the Protestant society of colonisation further this cause. An important French

40 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

association uses every means in its power to promote the culture of cotton in Africa. The results have been encouraging. The total production, which was practically nil a few years ago, reached the figures of 164,000 kilogrammes in 1907, 171,000 in 1908, and 238,000 in 1909.¹ National industries have adapted themselves to colonial needs and have shown great ingenuity in meeting new conditions. Important iron works, bridges, and piers have been made for the colonies. There have been constructed machinery for colonial agriculture, special means of transportation, contrivances for colonial comfort, transportable houses, colonial furniture for special districts and climates, new adaptations of rubber, gauzes, and wrapping clothes for use in distant lands. No people has made an earlier or better use of automobiles in the colonies than the French. As they had been great road builders, when the day of automobiles came these machines had before them uncommon possibilities.

At home the railroads have also made great advance. The old car, separated into inconveniently narrow compartments, is being replaced by the long car of comfortable dimensions. On important lines one may see vestibule trains.

¹ *Le Temps*, March 29, 1910.

The little *wagons*, which used to cost about 10,000 francs, have made way for others of palatial style costing over 60,000 francs. The railroads have increased from 17,929 kilometres in 1870 to 47,282 in 1906; their net income has risen from 383,000,000 francs to 778,000,000; the number of travellers from 95,000,000 to 459,000,000, and the tons of merchandise carried from 37,000,000 to 144,000,000. National roads and highways have increased from 368,000 kilometres to 575,000; canals and other water-ways from 1,075 kilometres to 1,207. In sixteen years the tonnage upon these water-ways has increased forty-two per cent.¹ Since 1866 the general tonnage of French ports has quadrupled.² The telegraph service leaped from 4,000,000 telegrams a year to 41,000,000, and the income from 11,000,000 francs to 43,000,000; the telephone in fourteen years had its communications increased from 20,000,000 to 232,000,000. From 1869 to 1905 the number of letters distributed by post-offices increased from 358,000,000 to 1,113,000,000, and the total income of the postal service from 94,000,000 francs to 262,000,000.³

Notwithstanding the almost irresistible com-

¹ *Annuaire statistique*.

² Théry, Ed., *Les progrès économiques de la France*, 1909, p. 250.

³ *Annuaire statistique*.

petition of wheat-growing countries having the advantage of a virgin soil, France still raises almost wheat enough for her own consumption. Instead of 102,000,000 hectolitres in 1873, the yield was 117,000,000 in 1905. Where she reaped 25 bushels, now she has 40. Oats have increased from 76,000,000 hectolitres to 95,000,000; beet-root sugar from 349,360 tons to 948,671, and alcohol from 1,591,070 hectolitres to 2,608,626.¹ The phylloxera, which years ago destroyed the greater part of the vineyards of France, and inflicted a loss now estimated at 10,000,000-000 francs,² has been practically stamped out. French wine-growers have shown great moral strength in fighting the evil, and replacing the plants destroyed. The vineyards, in 1871 extending over 6,397,000 hectares, were 6,516,000 in 1905; and the yield, which in 1871, 1872, and 1873 averaged 83,000,000 hectolitres, was 114,000,000 in 1905; it had been 118,000,000 the year before.

The former superstitions of cattle raisers, who made religious pilgrimages for the cure of their herds,³ or got priests to bless their flocks before

¹ *Annuaire statistique*.

² Hanotaux, G., *La France, est-elle en décadence?*; Théry, Ed., *o. cit.*, p. 135.

³ See *L'Illustration*, July 6, 1907, in which there is a picture of reton peasants carrying the tails of their sick cows and placing them upon the altar to secure the recovery of the animals.

starting for distant pastures,¹ is slowly, but surely, disappearing, giving place to the skill of the veterinary surgeon. The former no longer asks processions like that so beautifully pictured by Jules Breton, nor does he go to church to have the priest bless the seeds before they are intrusted to the ground, but rather goes to the agricultural chemist, buys proper fertilisers, seeks new markets, studies new demands and strives to supply them. He employs machinery upon an unprecedented scale. Not to speak of those made at home, almost all forms of American agricultural implements have been quickly introduced. During the summer of 1908, the writer, in the valley of the Loire, saw three reaping machines following each other in the same field; and *L'Illustration*, soon after, showed a procession of five in the same field of wheat. Under the Empire all this work was done by hand. The variety of agricultural and horticultural produce has also increased. The floral culture of the Riviera has become most important. Some parts of the South and Algeria, transformed into truck farms, have become the winter gardens of France and England. Frenchmen have never made their native soil yield more, or made more profitable uses of its produce.

¹ *Ibid.*, Jan. 8, 1907.

This great change has come from a better education and greater agricultural intelligence. Gambetta founded the Ministry of Agriculture. An important part of its functions has been agricultural education. This is given in its highest form by the National Agronomic Institute of Paris, by three veterinary schools with twenty-seven professors, and by the National School of Forestry of Nancy. Then there are three secondary schools of agriculture which study the peculiar problems of the regions in which they are situated, having a staff of twenty-six professors and twenty-nine lecturers. For this secondary grade of work, there are also the School of Agricultural Industries of Douai and the National School of Horticulture of Versailles. In the lower grade of instruction come thirty-four practical elementary schools of agriculture, viticulture, and horticulture; twelve schools of irrigation, of draining, of the care and uses of milk, of cheese making, and of the care of poultry; nine schools of arboriculture and the care of fruit, forty-two *fromageries-écoles*, at once cheese factories and schools for instruction in cheese making. Every one of the eighty-six departments has an experimental station. There are forty-two agronomic stations and laboratories for analyses, six stations of oenology, not

to speak of the thirteen stations of zoology, of entomology, of sericulture, of experiments with seeds, of vegetal physiology, of vegetal pathology, of animal physiology and cattle feeding, of vegetal physics, of fermentation and of testing machinery. There are also three schools for the training of girls for the duties which may devolve upon them in farming.¹

This agricultural transformation has also been accelerated by the improvement of roads,² by the greater facilities offered by railroads, by the reduction of farmers' taxes,³ and by the encouragements given to agricultural societies. The sum placed by the government at the disposal of 1,500 mutual loan banks⁴ is now 80,000,000 francs.⁵ At the Congress of Angers, July, 1907, M. de Rocquigny showed that agricultural associations, though of recent date, had reached the number of 3,553. Since 1900 they have doubled numerically. Against cattle mortality, there are 7,000 local mutual insurance

¹ *Annuaire statistique ; Annuaire de la jeunesse*, 1907.

² On April 10, 1879, there were voted at one meeting of the Parliament 200,000,000 francs for the roads of the country. (Rimbaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 184.)

³ In 1879, 1890, 1898, and 1905, important reductions of taxes were made. In the budget for 1898, they amounted to 26,000,000 francs. (Rimbaud, *Histoire de la civilisation contemporaine en France*, p. 749.)

⁴ Méline, J., *The Return to the Land*, New York, 1907, p. 94.

⁵ *Compte-rendu du sixième congrès national des syndicats agricoles*. (Foi et vie, Dec. 1, 1907.)

societies with 355,000 members, as well as 1,000 mutual insurance societies against fire.

Co-operative associations have rejuvenated the farming of some districts by introducing new forms of produce for the Paris markets, by developing the export of horticultural crops, and by using refrigerator cars to facilitate the transportation of perishables, meats and vegetables alike. These organisations have also paid some attention to the well-being of the rural population, the improvement of dwelling-houses for farmers, and to old-age pensions for aged toilers.¹

Such have been the improvements of farming life that an ever larger class turns to agriculture, so that the number of small land-owners is increasing. According to M. Ruau, Minister of Agriculture, there have been, during the last twenty years, only two out of eighty-seven departments in which concentration of property has taken place. The new education and the new life have taken traditional French agriculture out of the old ruts, and showed it a world of new possibilities which have been realised. It might be added that the government has elevated agriculture to the dignity of having a special decoration known as the *mérite*

¹ *Op. cit.*

agricole, although it may possibly be brought into disrepute by being distributed too freely.

The industries of the country have been quickened by science. Thus the ability to transmit electric energy to great distances has almost created a revolution. There has been a great rush in seizing and utilising all the waterfalls. The west side of the Alps alone can furnish 4,000,000 horse-power, and the Pyrenees, the Vosges, the Cévennes, and the central mountains may yield 5,000,000 more. This new power, now called *houille blanche*, "white coal," is more and more constituting a natural equivalent for the cheap coal which their English competitors enjoy. Again, the country, as compared with others, has a peculiar distribution of industrial interests. The salaried workmen are only five per cent more numerous than the employers or those who work on their own account. The 19,652,000 persons connected with French industries, in the largest sense of the term, are divided into two almost equal parts; 8,996,000 are either employers or those who work on their own account, while the employees number 10,655,000.¹ In spite of opposite tendencies elsewhere, in France this economic individual-

¹ Yves Guyot, *Le collectivisme futur et le socialisme présent*. (*Journal des Economistes*, July, 1906, p. 8.)

ism is growing. There were 592,600 industrial establishments in 1896 and 616,100 in 1906, a gain of 23,500 in ten years.¹ The advantage of such a condition is that it is a spur to individual ambition, that it is more favourable to the all-round development of the labourer, that it secures a wider distribution of profits, and that it makes for greater social and political stability. The disadvantage is that French industries find it hard to compete with the colossal organisations of the United States, of England, of Germany, and accordingly the industrial progress is not so striking.

Yet the whole produce of French industries, including those of Alsace and Lorraine, was about 5,000,000,000 francs in 1870,² and about 15,000,000,000 in 1897 — this, with Alsace excluded. One of the great auxiliaries of manufacturing, coal, was extracted to the amount of 13,000,000 tons in 1870 and 38,000,000 in 1905. In the meantime the production of pig-iron increased 217 per cent, that of iron and steel 200 per cent, and the extraction of iron ore 399 per cent.³ In fifteen years, from 1891 to 1906, the production of iron has increased 71 per

¹ *Op. cit.*

² Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire*; *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Jan., 1872, p. 227.

³ *Annuaire statistique*.

cent in quantity and 73 per cent in value.¹ Steam engines rose from 26,000, with 316,000 horse-power, to 79,000, with 2,232,000 horse-power, a gain of 303 per cent for the number of engines, and 706 per cent for their potential capacity.² From 1890 to 1902 the number of horse-power used in metallurgic industries rose from 167,584 to 354,856, and in textile manufacturing from 172,999 to 434,529.³

It is difficult for foreigners to realise the part which machinery has come to play in France. Many who in former days spent much time in devising new toys, now toil to invent new machines adapted to national needs. Visiting the mechanical part of the Paris Exposition of 1900 with Americans, the writer heard them again and again exclaim at the great advance of the French in mechanical art. The greater activity of inventors is seen from the fact that the number of patents issued in 1870 was 2,782, while that of 1905 was 12,953. Though the principle of industrial agglomeration is not so widely spread as in the United States, France has her Fall River in Roubaix, her Pittsburg at Le Creuzot, and numerous other centres where machinery is made and used upon a large

¹ Théry, *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

² Méline, *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

³ *Annuaire statistique.*

scale. Some of the great metallurgic works export machinery to every part of the world. One of them makes sixty tons of pig-iron in an hour. Provence has the largest and the best deposits of bauxite¹ in the world — a fact which has helped the recent and rapid progress of the making of aluminum, now used for electric cables. One of the ship-building yards turned out recently a steamer 450 feet long, of 10,000 tons, in nine months.

The ability to erect vast iron structures is not the sole possession of Germans, Englishmen, and Americans. The Eiffel Tower, the Suspension Bridge Giscard in the *Pyrénées orientales*, the Viaduct of Gabarit in the department of Cantal, Eiffel's superb iron bridge over the Douro River in Portugal, the iron bridge over the Red River in Indo-China, immense iron docks in the colonies, and the enormous guns made at Le Creuzot, show that French metallurgic works are capable of great things undreamed of four decades ago. Frenchmen were among the first to use electric locomotives on their railroads. They have done works of engineering in their roads and their canals which amaze foreigners by the boldness of the conception, their beauty of design, or their admirable execution. One

¹ Mineral for the making of aluminum.

of the colleagues of the writer looking at photographs of the masonry of the new railroad of Madagascar said: "We Americans have never done such superb work on a new railroad." Moreover, France was first in making submarine boats and remains first. Her place in aeronautics is such that inventors of dirigible balloons and of aeroplanes have gone to her for experiments and recognition. Her supremacy in the making of automobiles is yet widely recognised. They are in great demand abroad. She exported them to the amount of 51,000,000 francs in 1903, 71,000,000 in 1904, 101,000,000 in 1905, 138,000,000 in 1906,¹ and 145,364,000 in 1907.²

A Paris house furnished all the apparatus for the great light-house of Bombay. England buys annually from France over 50,000,000 francs' worth of finely wrought metallic works, chiefly copper.³ It is quite significant that French firms were asked to provide electric lighting for the London Exhibition of 1908.⁴ From 1891 to 1906 the country exported machines, metallic objects, tools, small sea craft, automobiles, etc., so that the excess of exporta-

¹ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 15, 1907, p. 875.

² Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

³ Bérard, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

⁴ *Le Siècle*, Nov. 19, 1907.

tions over importations increased from 117,000,000 to 473,000,000.¹ French jewelry wrought with great artistic perfection is more and more appreciated in all the great centres of the civilised world. Works in gold, hall-marked by the government, have increased 51 per cent from 1894 to 1906, those in silver 24 per cent. The exports of these increased 80 per cent for gold and 186 per cent for silver.² M. d'Avenel speaks of a French manufacturer who makes 150,000 kilogrammes of paper in a day.

Textile industries have undergone transformations of great importance. The hand weaving of the Empire has largely been replaced by the power-loom. The hand-loom is used only for the weaving of samples or for very small orders which are more easily worked that way. In some places the power-loom, worked by electricity, is in the home itself of the weaver. The cheap distribution of electric energy is now keeping the workmen at home. In small cities, and often in small villages, the baker makes his bread with electric kneading machines. The transformation of weaving by machine has not lowered the quality of the output; in fact the finest textile fabrics are so exquisite as to come nearer the decorative arts than to simple texture.

¹ Théry, *op. cit.* p. 22.

² *Annuaire statistique.*

France takes an ever larger part in the cutting of diamonds for the world. The crystals of Baccarat, the beautiful plates of Saint Gobain, and the china of Limoges have never enjoyed a greater popularity at home and abroad. *L'article de Paris* is ever in greater demand.

The artistic traditions and environments, high ideals of professional workmanship, and the specific educational efforts of the Republic have kept up the old superiority. The few technical schools existing under the Empire have been remodelled and many new ones have been founded. The *Conservatoire national des arts et métiers* (National Conservatory of Arts and Crafts), at once a laboratory of mechanical, physical, and chemical experiments, a patent office with a vast collection of models of inventors, a museum of devices to prevent industrial accidents and to improve industrial hygiene, has been made a great school of technology, devoting 1,368,963 francs to its work. There is also the *Ecole centrale des arts et manufactures* (Central School of Arts and Manufactures), preparing engineers for all forms of industry as well as for public works, whose budget was 732,349 francs in 1905. Then came four national schools of arts and crafts, at Aix, Angers, Châlons, and Lille, the expenses of

which are 1,838,290 francs. A fifth school of this kind has just been opened in Paris.

The purpose of these institutions is to train and improve overseers and manufacturers, keeping in view the character of the manufactures peculiar to the part of the country in which the school is situated. Thus the institution in Lille has a section devoted to spinning and weaving, while that of Paris will have one giving special attention to electricity, industrial chemistry, and automobilism. There are, again, the "National Practical School of Workmen and Overseers" of Chauny devoting annually to its purpose 367,864 francs, the schools of clock and watch making (*horlogerie*) in the eastern part of France spending 107,000 francs annually to improve the *personnel* in this branch of industry. In Arman-tières, Nantes, Vierzon, and Voiron are national professional schools to train workingmen for the positions of overseers and managers in large establishments. In 1905, their budget was 887,810 francs. Fifteen other industrial schools spend 713,613 francs in giving various forms of industrial education. One of them, the *Ecole du livre*, teaches its students the best way to print a book, to illustrate it, and to bind it. This institution, with two hundred students in day-time and two hundred and fifty at night, will

contribute to give a higher place still to the French book in the world. Twenty-six schools are at once giving an industrial education, and teaching the best methods for disposing of the fruits of industry; they are called "Schools of Commerce and Industry."¹ The number of students attending the higher industrial schools in 1905 was 3,737, and those in the more elementary 9,765.

The several great exhibitions in Paris, as well as those in the provinces, have been efficient agents of industrial progress. This has been increased by the many-sided development of energy in other realms of the nation's life, as well as by a wider culture and a keener intelligence. Frenchmen are now conscious of their peculiar place in the economic life of the world. They recognise that their products are not so much for the masses as for the classes. They realise that their well-being in a large measure depends upon the peace and prosperity of mankind.

¹ *Annuaire statistique* and *Annuaire de la jeunesse*.

CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE AND WEALTH

FRENCH commerce has above all become better organised. Under the Empire, the chambers of commerce were merely consultative, local advisory boards, hampered at every point by the government; but now they are unhindered and, what is more, they have become extremely numerous. Many have been founded in foreign countries where they serve French interests. The government now co-operates with them, and has enlarged the state machinery to further the development of trade. In 1882 was established the Superior Council of Commerce, a board of commercial advisers with a large experience to help the same cause. In 1897 was organised in the Ministry of Commerce the National Foreign Trade Office, the design of which is to furnish merchants with all the data which they wish in regard to the opportunities of trade in any foreign country. Its work is

done by interviews, or by means of the *Moniteur officiel du commerce*.

In 1898 was instituted the organisation of Counsellors of Foreign Trade, which numbers now 1,400. These counsellors are Frenchmen established in other lands, who send valuable information to the home office. They also find positions for young Frenchmen in those countries, with the view of acquainting them with commercial conditions and methods. There were likewise created foreign commercial scholarships, devoted entirely to students preparing for industrial or commercial pursuits. The government has gone even further in creating the institution of *attachés commerciaux* in connection with embassies and legations. These *attachés* may prove a sign of the times, giving more place to trade questions than to military ones. Societies of commercial geography were organised in Paris, Marseilles, Bordeaux, Lyons, Lille, and Nancy.¹ Commercial schools have been multiplied, rendered more practical and less academic. Superior schools of commerce were developed or established in twelve of the most important cities of the country outside of the capital. The Commercial Institute of Paris, founded in 1884, is largely devoted to the preparation of young

¹ Rambaud, *Histoire de la civilisation contemporaine en France*, p. 648.

men for foreign trade. The School of High Commercial Studies, with an annual budget of over 400,000 francs, is one of the best commercial institutions anywhere. Of the 61 papers representing commerce, 39 were founded under the Republic, and of the 270 journalistic organs of finance, 177 were started since 1871.¹

All these efforts must tell. Economic studies, a greater general intelligence, and a better professional training have done much toward the commercial and financial advance visible in so many directions. In gauging this gain we should remember that the French have not the advantage of Americans, with a new country of unlimited resources, and with methods which set aside all considerations of the future, who make havoc of forests, exhaust arable lands, and pick here and there the best from their best mines. In France the forests are in a condition of steady improvement. Under the Republic they have increased to the extent of 1,150,000 acres.² The soil is rendered more and more fertile, while mines are worked with a care demanded by their relative poverty. France, so rich in many things, has certainly not been favoured in the matter of mines.

Notwithstanding this, the annual commerce of

¹ *Annuaire de la presse*, 1909 pp. 844 and 852.

² *L'Illustration*, Oct. 13, 1906.

the country has increased more than 5,000,000,000 francs. From 1875 to 1907 it has risen from 7,500,000,000 to 11,819,000,000.¹ The increased commercial activity is shown by the fact that, while the Clearing House of Paris reported transactions amounting to 2,210,000,000 in 1875, thirty years later they had reached 26,095,000,000. The amount of business transacted by the Bank of France was 68,814,000,000 in 1871 and 236,975,000,000 in 1908;² the bank-notes of that institution increased from 1,544,000,000 in 1870 to 4,853,000,000 in 1908; its cash reserve rose from 1,130,000,000 to 3,956,000,000; and so abundant were the funds that interest fell from 5.71 per cent to 3 per cent. At the time of the American panic it rose to 3.45 per cent, but from 1900 to 1907 it averaged 3.03 per cent.³ The gold reserve of the bank has risen from 604,000,000 in 1881 to 3,052,000,000 in 1908.⁴

The Bank of France is the only bank of emission in the country, having in this respect a monopoly for which the nation is well compensated. Besides, not to speak of small banks, there are five great financial institutions, the *Crédit lyonnais*, the *Société générale*, the *Comptoir national d'escompte*, the *Crédit industriel et*

¹ *Le Temps*, Oct. 3, 1907.

² Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

³ *Annuaire statistique*.

⁴ *Annuaire statistique*.

commercial, and the *Société marseillaise*, large joint-stock corporations which receive deposits and make loans. From 1891 to 1907 their paid-up capital increased 395,000,000 and their deposits 2,389,000,000. On December 31, 1907, these deposits had reached the sum of 3,736,000,000.¹ By ingenious and plausible reasoning M. Théry, in his admirable book, estimates that their total transactions must have been 14,470,000,000 in 1891 and 34,362,000,000 in 1907.² In fifteen years the funds intrusted to the Bank of France and to these companies rose from 2,384,000,000 to 5,411,000,000. Such were the deposits during that period that the lending power of the Bank of France increased 61 per cent and the other institutions 177 per cent.³ The annual income from French and foreign securities, in France, averaged 1,635,496,000 francs during the period from 1884 to 1891, and from 1900 to 1907 it was 2,136,850,000 francs, that is, an increase of 501,354,000 francs.⁴ Assuming that the securities taxed by the government yield about 4.5 per cent, M. Théry infers that in twenty-five years a capital of 11,140,000,000 has been added to these investments.

During the American panic of 1907 French

¹ Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

² *Ibid.*, p. 287.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 298.

industries were severely tried, but banking institutions were scarcely affected. The Bank of France did not hesitate then to help the Bank of England. Those who, like the writer, remember the heroic efforts of M. Thiers, after the war, to borrow money for the Republic at impossible rates, cannot but marvel on seeing that the once vanquished, isolated, mistrusted France has become, in some respects, the banker of the world. We cannot refrain from quoting MM. Delpech and Lamy: "From 1884 to 1900, there were registered in France foreign bonds, bought by French citizens, to the amount of 16,729,000,000 francs, of which 6,500,000,000 were Russian bonds,¹ that is, a third of the total debt of Russia, which is 16,500,000,000; 1,752,000,000 of Turkish bonds, that is, more than one-half the debt of Turkey; 959,000,000 of Portuguese bonds, that is, almost a quarter of the total debt of Portugal; 802,000,000 of Spanish bonds 822,000,000 of Austria-Hungary bonds, while besides this Frenchmen own about 3,689,000,000 of foreign stocks. The whole of this represents a total of 20,000,000,000 francs invested by Frenchmen in foreign securities.²

¹ The statement quoted is from 1900. In 1907 the amount was 9,000,000,000. (*Le Temps*, May 13, 1907.)

² Delpech and Lamy, *Trente ans de république*, 1902, p. 57.

At the end of 1908 M. Alfred Neymarck, one of the most eminent economists of France, long president of the *Société de statistique*, sets at 30,000,000,000 francs French investments abroad.¹ M. Théry, the editor of the *Economiste européen*, values them at 37,000,000,000 on December 31, 1907.² What a change between the 10,000,000,000 or 12,000,000,000, according to Léon Say, of French investments abroad during the last days of the Empire,³ and the 37,000,000,000 now! That means an increase of at least 25,000,000,000 during the present Republic and 16,000,000,000 during the last sixteen years.⁴ Let us add that French traits of foresight and prudence show themselves at this point; their investments are mostly in bonds or national rentes, while Englishmen give prominence to stocks.⁵ This makes French finances more stable than those of most other countries. Be that as it may, from foreign securities France receives annually 2,000,000,000 francs of interest, and that in gold. Furthermore, this makes rates of foreign exchange most favourable to the country receiving the funds.

From 1892 to December 31, 1907, the stock of gold in France increased by 3,929,000,000 francs.

¹ Yves Guyot, *Le Siècle*, Dec. 8, 1908.

² More accurately 37,150,000,000. (Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 306.)

³ *Ibid.*, p. 304.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 306.

Of this 2,059,000,000 were coined into French money, 1,120,000,000 were taken by the trades of artistic gold work, and about 740,000,000 in various forms and in various ways have been deposited in institutions.¹ This, according to the same writer, means, at least, that when France has paid all foreign countries for what she draws from them in return for what she sends to them, *i. e.*, after paying all that needed to be paid, she has received 3,929,000,000 francs in gold, nearly one-fifth of the total production the world over during that time.² The wealth of the country, in stocks and securities of all kinds, which was 2,500,000,000 francs in 1851, 25,000,000,000 in 1880, 109,000,000,000 in 1900,³ was valued at 135,000,000,000 in 1906.⁴

It is difficult to gauge accurately the nation's wealth, but innumerable data, singly or collectively, point to a marked increase. The gain may be seen in the great advance which has taken place in the securities of the six great railroad companies of France, almost entirely owned by Frenchmen, as they are all guaranteed by the State. The bonds of the *Est* ran from 285 in 1871 to 440 in 1908; those of the *Paris-Lyon-*

¹ Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 346.

² *Ibid.*

³ Georges d'Avenel, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 1, 1906, p. 651.

⁴ Yves Guyot, *Le Siècle*, Oct. 13, 1908.

Méditerranée from 297 to 437; those of the *Midi* from 292 to 435; those of the *Nord* from 306 to 451; those of the *Orléans* from 297 to 438, and those of the *Ouest* from 291 to 431. The stocks of the *Est* have risen from 479 to 937; those of the *Paris-Lyon-Méditerranée* from 852 to 1,368; those of the *Midi* from 610 to 1,138; those of the *Nord* from 968 to 1,779; those of the *Orléans* from 816 to 1,382; and those of the *Ouest* from 509 to 853.¹ The reason of this remarkable rise is the increased prosperity, and an ever-growing larger use of the national net-work of railroads. In sixteen years, from 1891 to 1907, their gross earnings were 500,800,000 francs.² The same thing might be said of the other popular channels of French investments outside of national bonds. Legacies have risen from 4,567,000,000 francs in 1869 to 6,939,000,000 in 1907. During the period elapsing from 1884 to 1891 the average estate was 6,381 francs, and from 1899 to 1906 it reached 7,309 francs.³ Gauged by the assessors' lists, which are always below the real valuation, the national wealth has quadrupled in seventy-five years. It was 136,000,000,000 francs in 1869 and 204,000,000,000 in 1904. As a matter of fact, as the Comte Georges d'Avenel puts it, it is about

¹ *Annuaire statistique*, 1908.

² Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 324.

234,000,000,000 francs. It has increased one-half under the Republic.¹ M. Théry reaches nearly the same conclusion after basing his calculations upon the increased values of legacies.² Unfortunately we know only too well that assessors in every country fail to see all taxable property, and that in view of the inheritance tax heirs often come short of making an accurate report of the real wealth inherited.

With the progress of wealth has also come a better distribution of it than in most countries. The real estate of the land is in the hands of 8,454,000 owners. There are not five persons in France owning 25,000 acres of land, while in Hungary there are more than 200. One could not find one man in France with an income of 750,000 francs from land, while in Great Britain there are at least 175.³ We have shown that farming property is more and more widely distributed, and as the friends of large estates put it, it is increasingly *morcelée* (parcelled). In the *Journal des économistes*,⁴ Yves Guyot asserts that there are more than nine persons in ten who are directly or indirectly owners of real estate. In his paper, already referred to, *Le*

¹ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 1, 1906, p. 616.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 327.

³ Avenel, *Les Français de mon temps*, p. 260.

⁴ July 15, 1906, p. 8.

collectivisme futur et le socialisme présent, he sets it at twelve-thirteenths of the population. The same conclusion is forced upon us by the unusually wide distribution of inheritances.¹ Those above 5,000,000 francs scarcely exceed 6 per cent of the whole. Four-fifths are made up of small and moderate amounts.

The records of savings-banks point to the same facts. From 1872 to 1900 the number of depositors increased three times, and the amount deposited five times.² From 2,130,000 in 1869,³ notwithstanding stringent laws forbidding the possession of two bank-books, and bringing

¹ INHERITANCES IN FRANCE DURING THE YEAR 1907

AMOUNT OF INHERITANCES		NUMBER OF INHERITANCES	TOTAL OF INHERITANCES IN FRANCE
From 1 fr. to 500.....		116,323	27,688,200
501 " 2,000.....		106,807	135,161,500
2,001 " 10,000.....		114,695	562,248,100
10,001 " 50,000.....		7,703	532,410,900
100,001 " 250,000.....		5,018	776,396,200
250,001 " 500,000.....		1,713	602,805,800
500,001 " 1,000,000.....		814	579,240,200
1,000,001 " 2,000,000.....		360	501,585,500
2,000,001 " 5,000,000.....		134	389,140,600
10,000,000 " 50,000,000.....		7	107,405,800
Above 50,000,000.....		none	
Total.....		401,574	5,461,843,300

—(*L'Illustration*, Dec. 26, 1908.)

² Delpech and Lamy, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

³ *Annuaire statistique*.

down the maximum of deposits from 2,000 francs to 1,500, in 1906 there were 12,462,900 bank-books.¹ The deposits had risen from 710,000,000 francs to 4,710,000,000. It must be stated also that while the savings-banks encourage thrift, they have rendered a great service to the country by putting into circulation large sums which, before the Republic, remained unproductive in the "old stockings" of the lower classes.²

According to M. A. Neymarck, the people own 23,000,000,000 francs worth of stocks and bonds of the six great railroad companies of the country, and 26,000,000,000 of French *rentes*, held in small quantities.³ Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, author of one of the ablest books in French on the United States,⁴ said in Parliament that 17,000 out of the 31,000 stockholders of the Bank of France own only one or two shares.⁵ The institutions for savings have done a good educational work by teaching the people the value of national bonds and state-guaranteed securities as safe investments. The present state of national finance is satisfactory, not because it has always been guided by superior wisdom—though wisdom there has been — but because the spirit

¹ Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

² Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

³ *L'Illustration*, Jan. 3, 1905.

⁴ *Les Etats Unis au XX^e siècle*.

⁵ *Chambre des Députés*, Feb. 16, 1909.

of thrift and economy has never been more cultivated or more potent.

The reactionaries may oppose the Republic, but they should oppose it fairly, intelligently; and this they have not done. In choosing an issue, they have often selected the most unfavourable to them, namely, the financial condition of the land. They have circulated fables about the ruin of public credit, and more than once have endeavoured to start runs upon savings-banks. The finances of the Republic are not beyond criticism — where is the government above reproach in that respect? Yet even here we are forced by facts to find much that is creditable to Republican financial administration. The *Revue des Deux Mondes*, all along a stern censor of the Republic, has been forced to recognise that it “has mercilessly dropped any man whose reputation was soiled with financial intriguing either on behalf of himself or of his relatives.” The Republicans have gone to the very bottom of the Panama corruption, and punished the offenders with a severity from which Americans and British in similar instances have occasionally shrunk.

The financial legacies from the past were very heavy. Thus the budget for 1910, as first proposed by the Minister of Finances, amounts

to 4,027,000,000 francs; but of that 69,000,000 are devoted to pay the pension of Catholic priests, and for squaring accounts as well as estimates. The sum of 1,504,000,000 represents pensions, interest, and annuities on the national debt. The largeness of this sum comes, in a great measure, from the Franco-Prussian War, and from imperative national works, performed by the Republic, which should have been done by former governments. Seeing the extent to which France was backward as compared with other nations, the Republicans attempted to regain time by a multitude of works of national utility.

In this budget, 1,261,000,000 francs are allotted to the army, the navy, and the work of colonial defence. By the end of the nineteenth century, the Republic had spent at least 25,000,000,000 francs to reorganise the military and the naval forces of the country.¹ When all the great powers of Europe were enlarging their armaments, France could not but act likewise. In no country were those expenses voted to such an extent under the sense of a merciless national necessity. To the work of education are allowed 281,000,000 francs — a sum to curtail which would be tantamount to creating a revolution; 304,000,000 are devoted to the important postal,

¹ A. Neymarck, *Trente ans de finances*, p. 3.

telegraphic, and telephonic service—a sum compensated for by large returns; 245,000,000 go to public works—a small sum to keep in good condition the extensive and perfect system of French roads and other works of national utility. A sum of nearly 375,000,000 is the comparatively small amount left for other national services.¹

The number of functionaries has increased, but the state machinery does a national work several times larger. The improvements that were made and the new tasks performed demanded a new and a larger civil service. Hence the increase of public officials for which Republicans have been so constantly taken to task.²

¹ *Le Temps*, Sept. 8, 1909.

² In a village well known to the writer, a village whose population has scarcely varied since 1870, there were then four teachers and one of them was town clerk; now there are twelve, not to speak of two secularized nuns in the parochial school. The village has a regular town clerk, who is also librarian. Under the Republic an important highway service was created. This demanded the employment of several men for repairs. A letter-carrier then spent three or four hours a day to distribute a score or two of letters, and once a week a dozen weekly papers. Now there is a regular post-office, with a savings department, telegraph and telephone with three resident women employees, not to speak of several letter-carriers who distribute letters and papers in as large a quantity as they would in a busy American town of the same size. Money-orders, which under the Empire could be sent only from the *chef lieu de canton*, are very numerous at this office, as there is no bank in the community. The telegraph and the telephone do a large business, while the savings-bank department has become quite important. The two *gardes champêtres* have scarcely changed their functions. This remarkable increase of service entailed a corresponding increase in the number of employees.

Such being the case, there is nothing abnormal either in the swelling of the number of public servants from 285,000 in 1873 to 440,000 in 1906, or in the increment of expense from 340,000,000 to 700,000,000 francs.¹

Taxation has naturally increased at pretty nearly the same rate as wealth. In a paper before the *Société d'économie politique* of Paris M. Neymarck has shown that the cost of collecting the taxes has diminished while the methods have grown gentler.² Again, the Budget had to be increased so as to compensate for services formerly paid by the public, but now free. Under the Empire a fee was required in most of the common schools. Taxes have been removed from salt, soap, oils, paper, and hygienic drinks. Letter postage has been reduced from five to two cents. There has been a similar reduction for registered letters, money-orders, telegrams, and other postal services. Newspapers have benefited from an even greater diminution of rates. Express packages and judiciary formalities have been favoured in a similar manner.

Furthermore; French legislators have distributed taxes more equitably. But the tendency of recent years has been to tax revenue with cumulative rates and to proportion the tax to the

¹ *Le Siècle*, May 30, 1909.

² *L'Illustration*, May 25, 1901.

ability to meet it. After considering all the extenuating circumstances for congested budgets, there is no hiding of the fact that Socialists have been singularly indifferent to sound finance. There is further the depressing fact that the national debt is increasing and that in 1905 it had reached 30,460,000,000 francs.¹ Parallel with this is the reassuring consideration that public confidence has grown with the debt, as we may see from the gradual decrease of interest. French *rentes*, bonds, yielded 5.4 per cent of interest in 1872, 3.55 in 1890, and 2.98 in 1901. In June, 1871, 3 per cent bonds were quoted at 53.8, and on November 30, 1901, at 101 francs.² Even during the panic of 1907 they never fell below 95 francs.

But why is it that the Republic can borrow money at such low rates when the national debt is increasing? Is it because of blind patriotic feelings? In the first place, the people know that, when an expense is incurred, the budget makes provisions for its payment; that much of the national debt was contracted by measures of utility which will increase the people's wealth and revenue, and that, whatever befalls, the

¹ *The Statesman's Year Book*, 1907.

² Neymarck, *Paper read before the Société d'économie politique; Trente années financières*; and *Annuaire statistique*.

nation always pays its debts. This was seen at the beginning of the Republic, when some politicians proposed not to honour the loan which Gambetta had secured without adequate warrant during the war. The members of the Assembly set aside the question of legal form, and asked if the funds had been used for the country. The affirmative answer was at once followed with the order to pay. There is also the fact that before many years the French people will come into possession of the greater part of the railroads of the country. In case the government wishes to sell them, then the whole would more than cancel the national obligations; and if it preferred to operate them, they would remain good collateral assets. Again, an important feature of this debt, which makes it distinct from that of some European powers, is that it is held by Frenchmen. The interest paid does not drain the country of so much, but goes to multitudes of citizens who thereby feel more solicitude for the good order and prosperity of the country. The coupons of French *rentes* are statical forces on the side of good government.

CHAPTER IV

THE NEW EDUCATION IN THE NEW LIFE

IT is in the realm of education that we see the greatest and the most abiding changes under the Republic. People have become enthusiastic in this direction. The old pious doctrine of the social utility of ignorance has been relegated to the domain of mischievous superstitions. Nothing is further from popular anxiety than Renan's fear of "the day for human society when light has penetrated into all its strata."¹ After the Franco-Prussian War Frenchmen were directed by the thought that it was "the school-teacher who had won at Sedan," and that it was by education that France could regain her position in the world.

Led by this conviction the nation shrank from no sacrifice. Beautiful school-houses, spitefully called *palais scolaires* by the reactionaries, have been erected in the villages, *lycées* and

¹ *Discours et conférences*, 1887, p. 229.

college buildings in the cities. At one session, on July 3, 1880, after extensive study of the question, the Parliament voted that twenty-seven *lycées* be built.¹ In important centres fine edifices have been constructed for higher education. Twenty-five thousand school-houses have been built or rebuilt, to which were devoted no less than 800,000,000 francs.² From 1875 to 1905 the number of primary schools increased from 71,000 to 81,000, the number of teachers from 110,000 to 151,000, and the pupils from 4,716,000 to 5,568,000.³ In thirty-three years the illiterate have fallen from 56,116 to 11,044. The day of dirty school-houses and of giving children different instruction according to their poverty or wealth is gone.⁴ There is no longer the *banc des pauvres* and the *banc des riches*, as they existed in some towns. Attendance at school has been made compulsory and tuition free.

The Republic recognises the birthright of every child to a common education, and everything is done for him to have it. If he is prevented from attending school because he is shoeless or because he has inadequate food, the town is bound to provide the imperative needs.

¹ Rambaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 166.

² Delpech and Lamy, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

³ *Annuaire statistique*.

⁴ Rambaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 144.

The State more and more compels parents to send their children to school, and society to provide for their most essential wants. As a good many children remained outside of this education because of their mental deficiencies, the government provided for the special instruction of abnormal and backward pupils.

The teaching itself, but imperfectly accessible to the masses under the Empire, has been raised, from scant ability to read and write, a little arithmetic, history, and the catechism, to a standard equal to the best in any country. The branches taught are morals and civics, reading and writing French, elements of French literature, geography, history, elementary principles of law and of political economy, drawing, modelling, music.¹ An important innovation is that of *l'art à l'école*,² or art teaching in common schools, whereby is cultivated the love of beauty so especially needed by the masses. The moral teaching, which we discuss at length elsewhere,³ exerts a strong influence upon the population. The schools have been made un-

¹ Vuibert, *Annuaire de la jeunesse*.

² An interesting society, *Société nationale de l'art à l'école*, is doing much for this valuable training. Its programme is: "*L'école saine, aérée, rationnellement construite et meublée, attrayante et ornée. Formation du goût par le décor; initiation de l'enfant à la beauté des lignes, des couleurs, des formes, des mouvements, et des sons.*"

³ See chapter XI.

sectarian, but not godless, as affirmed in the denunciatory reports of the clergy, for whom a godless school is one in which they do not rule.

This education also has been so decidedly differentiated as to adapt it better to the practical every-day life of French youth. There have been opened schools of apprenticeship, normal schools of cutting and fitting for girls, important professional schools.¹ There have been founded or transformed more than three hundred schools of design and decorative art. In Paris these schools contribute greatly to the superiority of taste and form visible in most of the fine goods made in that city. In many places the technical character of the schools is determined by local industries. In Roubaix the institution is correlated with weaving, in Aubusson (Creuze) with tapestry, in Limoges with ceramics, in Nice with domestic decorations, in Rennes with sculpture, and in Calais with lace. More than 100,000 pupils attend these schools.²

The secondary schools have not undergone such a profound transformation as the others, but, as a whole, they have never been better nor more numerous. The pupils have increased

¹ Rimbaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 160. See also *New England Magazine*, July, 1900, p. 588, "What France does for Education."

² Trouillot, *Pour l'idée laïque*, p. 253.

from 129,000 to 193,000.¹ The military and the monastic spirit, so prominent in them under the Empire, has lost much of its power. Eleven years ago the *proviseur* of one of the finest *lycées* in Paris told the writer that he, the *proviseur*, was in his institution like a colonel at the head of his regiment. No Paris *lycée* director would use such language now. The monachal tendency to isolate the pupil from home and society is growing less. The former antithesis between school and life is melting away before pedagogic intelligence, and the school tends to become life. The best school is not only the one in which the students stand high at examinations, but the one in which they lead the best life.

This desire to bring education closer to life has led educators to recast their methods with results disappointing to many, but above all to reformers. As most of these reformers were state professors, it followed that they were the severest censors of their own work. The representatives of sectarian institutions² find their own schools perfect, but this only shows the greater independence and the higher pedagogical ideals of the secular masters. The curricula, without

¹ *Annuaire statistique*.

² See Du Lac (R. P.), *Jésuites*, p. 227.

breaking all connection with Latin and Greek, have been thoroughly modernised, and German, as well as English, has now an important place. Recognising the disciplinary and cultural value of the ancient classical languages, educators have made it possible for students prepared in modern languages to acquire the others in the latter part of their course. Sciences have a place that is ever growing. Philosophy, which was scarcely taught at all during the Empire, is required for all complete secondary studies.

While much has been done for young men in this particular field, a new era has also been opened for young women. Some noble attempts to provide higher education for them by Minister Duruy had relatively failed, because of the opposition of the bishops. Jules Ferry placed the whole matter upon a broad educational basis.¹ This movement has now acquired considerable momentum. The reasonableness of the higher education of women is so thoroughly accepted that no one discusses it now, and its former opponents impart it in their own institutions. In

¹ When the question was debated in Parliament amidst the unreasonable opposition of conservatives, Ferry spoke of women who asked him the questions: "But what is the use of all this learning? What is it for? . . ." He continued: "I could answer, 'To raise your children,' and it would be a good answer, though trivial, but I prefer to say, 'To raise your husbands.'" (Rimbaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 135.)

1881 there were but few secondary schools for women; in 1906 there were 41 *lycées* and 68 other institutions giving to women a partial secondary education. The attendance has increased from 4,500 to 32,500. In 1909 3,500 young women had matriculated in the universities of the land.¹ Meanwhile it was recognised that women would be efficient for the moral teaching of boys.² Numerous schools for women were created to prepare an able corps of primary teachers, and one was established at Sèvres to give the professors of secondary institutions for girls the high training which they need. In speaking of this institution we must put away from our thought the peculiar education associated with normal schools in this country. Sèvres lacks only the classics to make its work the best given to women anywhere. Only candidates of great ability, recruited from all parts of France, may be admitted into the institution after the severest tests. It is not a common distinction to be a *Sévrienne*.

We must, perhaps, look to the realm of superior education for the most marked advance. Freed from the clerical interference which was formerly a disturbing force at every point, it is

¹ *Le Siècle*, March 30, 1909.

² *L'éducation morale dans l'université*, 1901, p. 73.

conducted by a large body of men who have done extensive scientific research or won a commanding position in scientific teaching. There are, first of all, the faculties doing graduate work. In thirteen years, from 1876 to 1889, the number of chairs has risen from 625 to 1,211, the number of medical students from 3,868 to 6,455, the scientific students from 121 to 1,355, and the advanced students of letters from 138 to 2,358.¹ From 1876 to 1906 the total number of students has sprung from 6,000 to 35,670.² From 1871 to 1905 the number of degrees of all kinds increased from 8,936 to 11,900 annually. The degrees of doctor of medicine rose from 308 to 1,101, and those of doctor of letters, doctor of science, and doctor of law, from 73 to 560. There can be no better index of the progress of superior studies under the Republic.

In attaining these results the municipalities have united with the State, which, in this work, has been nobly sustained by the nation. In 1907 the municipal council of Paris voted to support nine chairs of higher learning in the city, to say nothing of other encouragements given to different forms of scientific work. Other cities have voted important sums to encourage

¹ Rambaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 176.

² Delpech and Lamy, *op. cit.*, p. 25, and *Annuaire statistique*.

local universities. Individuals have come forward with generous gifts, while the Parliament has been most constant in its liberal support. New institutions have been created, some of which constitute absolutely new departures, such as the Practical School of High Studies of the Sorbonne, the Sèvres School for Women, the School of High Social Studies, the College of Social Sciences, the School of the Louvre, the Thiers Foundation, the National Agronomic Institute, the Colonial School, the School of Physics and Industrial Chemistry, the Pasteur Institute of Paris, the Pasteur Institute of Lille, the Free School of Political Sciences, the Social Museum, the Pedagogical Museum, the School of Anthropology, the School of High Commercial Studies, etc. Even in Algiers institutions have been founded with the view of making there, sooner or later, a great African university and a great African academy. A law was passed during the last days of 1889 to create this university. By the side of the celebrated French art schools of Rome, and of Athens, there were established schools of history and of archæology, not to speak of kindred institutions at Cairo, in Indo-China, or in Tunis.

One of the most fruitful steps for the advance of higher learning has been the enlargement of

the National Library with greatly increased facilities of research. The museums of Paris and, to some extent, of the provinces, have been increased and multiplied. The Louvre has been enriched by grants from the government, by the co-operation of the *Société des amis du Louvre*, and by large gifts of individuals. The legacy of the late M. Chauchard will attain a value of at least 40,000,000 francs. Individuals have created the establishments known as the Cernushi, Guimet, de Caen, Galliera, and Gustave Moreau museums. Recently was founded the Museum of Decorative Arts. Dutuit gave a collection worth many millions which, elsewhere than in Paris, would be called a museum. Broca left materials for the Museum of Anthropology, and Count de Chambrun made possible the accumulation of data bearing upon the social question at the Social Museum. Equally important is the Pedagogic Museum, where are centred all data needed by teachers. To the number of these institutions should be added the Museum of Comparative Sculpture, the Museum of Ethnography, the Carnavalet Museum, the Colonial Museum, the Artillery Museum, the Museum of the Palace of Justice, etc. All these, in their own way, are potent agencies of national education.

Paris has not been alone in this direction, for museums have sprung up everywhere in large centres. The Guimet Museum, a museum of the religions of the Far East, was started in Lyons, though later on transported to Paris. In Arles, the poet Mistral founded the Arlesian Museum, devoted to relics and mementos of Provençal life. A local society interested in its provincial past founded the admirable museum, the Vieux-Honfleur,¹ in Honfleur. In Bayonne was inaugurated the *Musée Bonnat*. M. Hector-Depasse organised the *Société du musée cantonal de Fresnay-sur-Sarthe*. M. Jules Lambart instituted also a museum in Doullens (Somme). It would be tedious to mention all that has been done both by individuals and by the government, in creating these foundations, instructive by what they contain as well as by the educational work done in them.

Among the most important agencies have been those of laboratories, to which we refer more fully later on, of scientific missions, of explorations in connection with the Ministry of Public Instruction. An achievement second to none has been the revival of old universities, and the creation of new ones. This is bound to raise the general level of life all over the country. It is

¹ *La Revue*, Sept. 25, 1909.

also a step forward in the direction of educational decentralisation so much needed, a step in keeping with the new spirit of the teachers. Of these men now no one can question the moral superiority. In his book, *Le malaise de la démocratie*, so severe against contemporary France, M. Gaston Deschamps says: "Recent statistics place the teaching body in the first rank of public morality."¹ The same thing might be said of their open-mindedness. They seem ultra modernists to the conservatives, and conservatives to the ultra radicals; but the truth is that they are live, progressive men who, as a whole, would do great credit to any professional class in the country.

One striking change in the situation is the greater freedom of the educator. He is no longer an adjunct of the priest, though now by an unfortunate, yet natural, reaction he has become too often his antagonist. Under the Empire the priest represented the greatest directing force in the lives of individuals; now, it is the teacher. It is to be deprecated that both stand for different ideals which in their own eyes are mutually exclusive. In the conflict, the teachers are no longer isolated among themselves. To the united front of the clergy they oppose the

body of teachers. One of their organisations, the *Fédération des amicales d'instituteurs*, has 96,000 members.¹ Another is the *Ligue de l'enseignement*. This agency, though founded in the last days of the Empire, attained no great development until the Republic. It has federated some 4,000 independent societies, with 600,000 members, the purpose of which is to advance and defend, if need be, free popular republican education. The more intense the attacks of the clericals, the greater the sense of solidarity which binds the teachers. They meet on the occasion of the *conférences pédagogiques* when they compare experiences.² There has been also instituted the National Pedagogic Congresses, in which are discussed all the problems of education by those who know its conditions and difficulties. French teachers, though poorly prepared for this by the Empire, have learned to conduct these meetings with ability, and generally with becoming dignity. Time will show whether or no they will avoid an alliance with socialism, which, in our opinion, would be baneful. The organised educators of a country should not formally or otherwise identify themselves with any one party. The aspirations of some of them to form trades-unions, and identify them-

¹ *Le Siècle*, April 19, 1909.

² Rambaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 160.

selves with the militant labour organisations of the country, would be deplorable for the best interests of schools.

The administration of education also has been transformed. The reign of educational arbitrariness, though not ended, has been singularly limited. The teachers are no longer the mutes who, under the Empire, accepted superior decisions concerning them with silence and awe. They cannot be dismissed without a hearing from the *conseils académiques*, the members of which, instead of being appointed by the Minister, are now elected by their colleagues. The Superior Council of Public Instruction has been reformed and also made elective. Its members are not raised to this high position because they are bishops or pastors, but because they are foremost among the educators of the country. The whole force of education is no longer the machine which led a minister of Napoleon III to say that by looking at his watch he could know what was taught, at that very moment, in any school of the country. It has become an organism in touch with the needs of Frenchmen. In it we see traces of the influence of such well-known educators as Gréard, Liard, Bréal, Croiset, Lavissee, Pécaut, and others who had a keen intelligence of the stupendous task before them.

In appreciating the educational record of the Republic one should remember that results have been accomplished notwithstanding an opposition which was constant. So conscious were the legislators of the great needs in this realm that they consented to large requests for funds made by the friends of learning. Already in 1888 M. R. Fernandez said that the budget of education was twelve times that of the reign of Louis Philippe, and five times that of the Empire.¹ It was 24,000,000 in 1870 and 281,000,000 in the budget for 1910.² These figures do not include local appropriations, the sacrifices made for new buildings, nor the extensive gifts of Catholics to sustain their universities in Paris, Lille Angers, and Lyons, the expenses of their boarding (*collèges*) and their parochial schools.

We differ absolutely from Catholics in their ideals of teaching as well as in their perpetual aim to control the national education; but we cannot fail to recognise the importance of their colossal work or that of Protestants. By the side of the national school is the work of the *Société pour l'instruction élémentaire*, of the *Association polytechnique*, and of the *Association philotechnique*. In 1875 was organised the *Union française de la jeunesse* to combine ele-

¹ *La France actuelle*. 1888. n. 405

² *The Times*. Nov. 23, 1909.

mentary education and professional training. The *Alliance française* helps and sustains schools in every part of the world, and gives, in various parts of France — and largely in Paris — instruction in the French language to foreigners. The *Société d'enseignement moderne*, also founded under the Republic, has many courses of commercial, industrial, literary, and artistic education. There are other associations with the same end in view. Some French periodicals, apart from their direct influence, by their reading matter, have done and are doing, educational work. The *Revue générale des Sciences* organises annual scientific cruises; *La Revue hebdomadaire*, *Les Annales politiques et littéraires*, *Foi et vie* have courses of lectures of great value. Lectures for the masses with various purposes, but of some educational value, are given everywhere.

Apart from this there is a vast effort made to keep the pupils in touch with the schools after they leave them. The associations which are formed, called “petites A,” number 6,476. The school *patronages*, looking also after the former pupils, number 2,255. During the year 1908–9 the number of evening schools was 31,637, while 74,869 persons gave their labours mostly without compensation.¹ When

¹ Edouard Petit, *Rapport sur l'éducation populaire en 1908–1909*.

we survey the work done in this field, we find ourselves confronted with one of the greatest enterprises for national education in our own time. If we look for any one of the great determinants of progress in any domain — agriculture, industry, commerce, art, science, philosophy, philanthropy, and even religion—we find everywhere the school.

CHAPTER V

CHANGES IN LITERATURE, ART, AND PHILOSOPHY

THERE has always been a closer relation between education and letters in France than in other countries, and hence from the achievements already noted in one realm we may expect similar progress in the other. The literary history of the country during the last thirty years would compare favourably with the most famous period of the same duration in the past. The characteristic traits of this literature have been more truth, more ideas, a closer touch with life, fewer abstractions, more facts, a less sonorous, but more real, love of humanity. It has stood less for the classes and more for the masses. It has become more democratic, even in the hands of aristocratic writers. The pessimistic strain in much of it is a transient literary fashion rather than the embodiment of national views of life. The departments of literature have been so differentiated as to produce a

greater variety than ever before, and their representatives have been superior as real men and women.

Criticism, without being less æsthetic, has become more potent by being more sociological and more philosophical. It has become rich in men of merit and of originality. Scherer belongs to the Republic as much as, if not even more than, to the Empire which was distinguished by that "prince of critics," Sainte Beuve. Brunetière, Lemaître, Sarcy, Bourget, Faguet, Anatole France, Pellissier, Gaston Deschamps, Rod, and de Vogüé constitute a group of critical intelligence superior to any which could have been dreamed of under Napoleon III, exerting its many-sided influence over a much wider range. Instead of the literary formal æsthetic judgment of a previous period, it has tended more and more to be the criticism of life, of the forces that make for life and their expression in literature.

Sardou, de Bornier, Coppée, and Rostand have given a new splendour to the historical drama. Dumas fils, Paul Hervieu, Brioux, de Curel, Lavedan, and Bernstein have plays of unusual power, with moral lessons which lift them above the realm of amusement and make them potent social forces. These men have written plays

of singular originality, strong psychological and moral analysis, with an ethical purpose which is new. The lighter forms of the drama were not richer in grace, in fancy, in wit, or in unconscious immorality during the Second Empire.

The lyric muse has more than held her own; in fact one may say that there has been a revival of poetry in the country. Victor Hugo gave his last songs under the Republic. Then there are the works of de Hérédia, Coppée, Dorchain, and, above all, those of Sully Prudhomme, one of the greatest poets of France. It is not insignificant that he was the first man of letters to receive the Nobel prize. Even the other poets, Verlaine, Jean Lahor, de Rénier, and many others, besides doing much creditable work, have added new stops to the organ of French poetry. The French Academy has never crowned so many poets as under the Republic. An anthology of contemporary French poetry,¹ published in 1906, gives extracts from 240 poets. It is true that all did not live during the Republic and all are not French citizens, but there are in this work omissions enough, if given, to sustain the opinion that at least 240 French poets have, of recent years, written poetry deemed worthy by a leading Paris professor to be represented in extracts

¹ Walch, G., *Anthologie des poètes contemporains*, 1906.

intended for schools. It is a significant fact that in June, 1909, there was given in Paris a public poetical competition of the best poems of the year. The organisation of this festival of the muses was very deficient, but the event in itself is an index of genuine interest in poetry.

In fiction, Daudet, Loti, Rod, Bourget, Anatole France, Maupassant, Theuriet, Bordeaux, Barrès, Bazin, Zola, Huysmans, de Vogüé, and Jules Verne would, as a band, compare favourably with any other group of French novelists at any period in the history of their country. Under them, the French novel has evolved in almost every direction, becoming at once more idealistic in spirit and more realistic in substance. While, as a whole, untrue to French life, it has come nearer to it; and it is, to-day, a great agent for the distribution of all forms of knowledge to the masses, a vehicle for the discussion of all possible questions, and a great sociological force. During the Empire, with notable exceptions, it was an admirable toy; now it has become a potent social tool.

Political oratory, as brilliant as, and more solid than, during the preceding reign, may point with pride to Gambetta, Léon Say, Challemel-Lacour, de Mun, Deschanel, and Jaurès. While these men are still largely inspired by the great

French traditional oratory, one that lays especial stress upon the æsthetic side of public speaking and delights in Ciceronian periods, a new form of public eloquence has appeared which is the simple, straightforward voice of the masses of the nation. Judicial eloquence has been signally represented by Rousse, Waldeck-Rousseau, Bétolaud, and Labori. Academic eloquence, either in the universities or at the French Institute, has rivalled its best days by the elevated discourses of Lavissee, of Brunetière, of Gaston Boissier, of Renan, and of several others. The Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish pulpits have never attained such a high level; even if great orators are not, they have never been, common. Popular public speaking, found now in every quarter of French society, and voicing every popular interest, is a child of the Republic.

A whole literature, able and wholesome, has been devoted to the artistic and picturesque history of the country. Essays are very numerous. The literary productions of reviews have become absorbing in France as in other countries. Corporate institutions give increasing encouragement to literature. The prizes of the French Academy have increased to such a degree that not infrequently they have been conferred upon very obscure and unworthy writers. There has

also been founded the De Goncourt Academy, with the same end in view, though with different methods from those of the illustrious company of the Palais Mazarin. A society of eminent French women gives an annual prize to a woman writer. It would be impossible to enumerate the new encouragements given by different societies to various *littérateurs*, not to speak of the *Prix littéraire de Rome*, founded three years ago by the government to enable annually a young writer to travel.

In the domain of fine arts the success of the great exhibitions and the Salons have been eloquent refutations of former aristocratic taunts that a democracy is doomed to an inferior art. Here again the Republic introduced the principle of liberty by allowing artists to organise their Salon themselves. When a second one was founded, the same policy was followed. The government has done nobly. In every direction it has sustained efforts to lift and popularise art. The budget of Fine Arts has increased 133 per cent. In 1874 was organised in the Ministry of Public Instruction the *Commission de l'inventaire général des richesses d'art de la France*, whose work is still going on.¹ Apparently few

¹ Lasteyrie, *Bibliographie des travaux historiques et archéologiques*, vol. I, p. 167.

artistic and historical mementos of the past have escaped its researches. Never before was so much done anywhere to restore and save old monuments — the Mont St. Michel, the Roman arenas of the south, Roman gates, Mediæval and Renaissance castles like those of Pierrefonds and Azay-le-rideau, historic town halls, old museums, cathedrals all over the country, churches, and chapels.

It would take a volume to set forth the work done to bring out the real beauty of the old ecclesiastical monuments, or at times to protect them when necessary from a clergy having no sense of their æsthetic worth. The renowned châteaux have been made repositories of great art treasures, where they now can be admired by every one. The Duc d'Aumale made the French Academy trustee for the nation of the Château of Chantilly. M. Siegfried gave the Château de Langeais, while the Minister of Fine Arts did his utmost to make every fine structure of artistic or historic worth the property of the nation.

The Hôtel de Ville of Paris, the new Sorbonne, the Trocadéro, the Gare d'Orléans, the Alexander III Bridge, the Petit Palais, and the Grand Palais are among the most superb erections of our time. The city of Paris gives prizes to those

who erect the finest houses, to those who, with flowers, decorate most felicitously the fronts of their homes,¹ and even to those who revive in the most picturesque manner the old-fashioned commercial signs. Who could be so blinded by prejudice as to fail to see the æsthetic progress of Paris? Do not the parks and squares show innumerable evidences of improvement? Are not the streets of Paris, so admired by Philip Gilbert Hamerton² a quarter of a century ago, much more attractive now? There is certainly no possible comparison between the plain, monotonous, geometrical architecture of the city during the Second Empire, and the beautiful, graceful, varied, and dignified character of recent Parisian erections.

The same thing might be said of a goodly number of cities, like Tours and Orléans, while in the rural districts better architectural ideas are making way. Even the viaducts of railroads constructed in recent years indicate advance. The mud houses and the thatched roofs of a former generation are replaced by something, often vulgar enough but yet better. When did French sculpture, as a whole, exhibit more vitality and more power than during the period

¹ *L'Illustration*, Jan. 9, 1904.

² *Paris in Old and Present Times*, 1885, p. 219.

of Carpeaux, Frémiet, Dubois, Chapu, Barrias, Guillaume, Falguière, Idrac, Aimé Millet, Mercié, Bartholomé, Dalou, Rodin, and Bartholdi? When were such medals produced as those of Chapelain, of Chapu, of Dupuis, or the inimitable work of Roty? What can the Napoleonic régime oppose to the engravings of Léopold Flameng? What period of French history of equal duration could present an array of names like Paul Baudry, Meissonier, Cabanel, Chartran, Carolus-Duran, Benjamin-Constant, Jules Breton, Rosa Bonheur, Puvis de Chavannes, François Flameng, Bastien-Lepage, Jean-Paul Laurens, Emile Lévy, Mme. Edmont-Breton, Protais, Moreau, Bonnat, Ribot, Manet, and Monet — to mention only a few names?

Nothing shows the power of contemporary French art more than its radiation all over the civilised world. Never more than now have foreigners resorted to French art schools or subjected themselves to the teaching of French masters. In all the museums one is struck by the prominence of artistic works produced by France during the last four decades. Rodin has some of his statuary in every centre of artistic culture. Eminent architects turn to Gallic artists for important mural paintings, whether it be the symbolic canvas of Puvis de Chavan-

nes for the Public Library of Boston, or "The Surrender of Yorktown," by Jean-Paul Laurens, for the Court House of Baltimore. French artistic inspiration shows itself in the works of great American artists whether they build Trinity Church of Boston or the Public Library of the same city.

French architects have carried the day in almost all great international competitions. Bénard designed the plans for the University of California; Rey, the Government Palace of Rio Grande del Sol, Brazil; Cardonnier, the Peace Palace of The Hague; Bouvard, the Pantheon of Brussels to the memory of illustrious Belgians; Robert and Hameau, the Government Palace of Lima, Peru; Flamant and Toussaint, the Parliament Building of Montevideo; Cret, the Home of South American Republics in Washington. One can hardly enumerate the most important commercial, philanthropic, and residential structures erected by French architects in other lands. Few are the great cities which have not some monuments by French artists. Landowski and Bouchard have been selected to erect the Calvin monument in Geneva. When it was decided to have a monument symbolising the union of the world by the postal-union, Paul de Saint-Marceau created his superb

work which is now one of the finest ornaments of Berne.

At home applied arts are doing wonders for the beautifying of French homes as well as of public buildings. Mural paintings, elegant wallpaper, artistic furniture, exquisite cut glass, beautiful ceramics, those of Sèvres from the government manufacture, and those from individual works in Limoges and elsewhere, the superb tapestries of the Gobelins and of Beauvais, not to speak of those of independent manufacture, ornamental leather, and choice bookbindings show the progress of the decorative arts.

In music there is the work of Gounod, Delibes, Massenet, Saint-Saëns, Debussy, Guilmant, men appreciated as much in foreign countries as at home. The Opera has never been such a power for high musical culture as now by the variety of its repertoire and its interpretation of the greatest French masterpieces. Serious music has never been more popular. The concerts organised by Colonne in 1873, by Lamoureux in 1882, and the *Chanteurs de Saint-Gervais*, later on transformed into the *Schola cantorum*, have done much to popularise good music. There are ten concerts worthy of the name for one under the Second Empire. Musical organisations, bands, and choral societies are everywhere

Theatrical art has representatives of whom any country might be proud. Mounet-Sully, Sarah Bernhardt, Coquelin and Lebargy have attained a great eminence in their interpretation of the French drama. Not only has the dramatic *répertoire* become richer than before, but it has also been rendered more cosmopolitan by the addition of the masterpieces of Greece, of Rome, of Scandinavia, of Germany, and by the reproduction of Shakespeare, at times with incomparable splendour. The *Comité Shakespearien* is doing much to deepen interest in the great English dramatist. Contemporary British and American playwrights have also had their pieces presented.

A noteworthy trait of this artistic progress is that in all its phases it tends more and more to reach the masses and to help them. With that end in view, the government has forwarded this movement by as many measures as possible. The actors and actresses of the Théâtre-Français have been allowed to play in various parts of the country. Adequate support has been given to the *Bibliothèque de l'enseignement des Beaux-Arts*, which has endeavoured to popularise every known form of art, while the Louvre continues its superb work of reproducing its art treasures, either by casts, by engravings or by photographs,

which are sold at an insignificant price. Private enterprise has issued works of artistic popularisation in which one knows not what to admire most, the exceptional character of the works or the prices at which they are put into the hands of readers. Art, which under the Empire was the privilege of the few, has come to be the common heritage of the many. If this popularisation has been attended with debasing uses of a noble power, it is true of almost all the arts of peace, and in all countries.

As to philosophy, until the foundation of the Republic it had been discouraged by the Church, and consequently by the government, as dangerous. It had never enjoyed freedom. It is a sad fact to repeat that French philosophy never was free. In order to exist, it had been compelled to be extremely considerate of theology and the clergy who, at any time, could have secured its exclusion from the schools. Another misfortune of French philosophy was that it had to be extremely literary to secure readers, as a philosophical reading public had yet to be constituted. The finest works on the subject were rather literary philosophical discussions, without any fundamental principles, than philosophy itself. At best it was the eclecticism of Cousin corrected by his disciples. Even in this form it

was unpopular among conservatives. In fact, after the *coup-d'état*, Napoleon, seeking the support of the clergy, forbade the teaching of any philosophy at all, though an exception was made for formal logic.¹ The emperor relented later on, but instruction in this field was always more or less under suspicion.

Under the Republic philosophical studies have been stimulated. Professors of philosophy have become numerous. The Faculty of Letters of Paris has nine, the Collège de France has three, the Catholic Institute has five, not to speak of other institutions for secondary education. Every *lycée* and *collège* is provided with at least one professor of philosophy. Let one read the following text-books: Boirac, *Cours élémentaire de philosophie*;² F. J., *Cours de philosophie*;³ Janet (P.), *Eléments de philosophie scientifique et de philosophie morale*;⁴ A. Penjon, *Précis de philosophie*;⁵ Malapert (P.), *Leçons de philosophie*⁶ — five manuals of philosophy among those that are used — and one cannot avoid the conclusion that pedagogic philosophy is presented wisely and efficiently to French students. Further, there is a common agreement among those who have been sympathetic observers of

¹ Janet, P., *La philosophie française contemporaine*, 1879, p. 50.

² 1902.

³ Tours, 1896.

⁴ 1890.

⁵ 1897.

⁶ 1907.

French secondary schools that philosophy is the subject best taught, and one taught by the ablest men among educators.¹

Formerly the subject-matter of this study was given in a very definite programme, from which the professor was not free to depart either in the scope of his course or in the official doctrine; but now there is greater freedom. Philosophical teachers are no longer a timid little group of thinkers, but constitute a distinguished class of earnest, truth-loving, sincere men, who mark a signal advance upon their predecessors. They are not the narrow, sectarian rationalists represented by the Clericals, but men who, as a rule, believe in genuine freedom of thought. At first, students were led by the desire to find in philosophy weapons against what they called "ecclesiastical despotism" rather than by the love of truth, but now the polemical stage is passed. The former tendency to delight in the display of argumentative skill, in philosophical skirmishing, has been gradually replaced by endeavours to give a larger place to reality, to develop a greater capacity for reasoning from facts, and to cultivate philosophy for its own worth.

¹ *Pour et contre l'enseignement philosophique*, 1894. See letters by M.M. Bontroux, Janet, and Fouillée.

The system propounded in the student world has been the eclectic theism of Cousin, now more and more superseded by neo-Kantism,¹ though the professors have had their ideas somewhat coloured by the Positivism of Comte and the Evolutionism of Spencer. It may be added that this teaching has no longer the unity of former days, but this the genuine philosophical student cannot deplore. So great has been the interest aroused that even the Catholic Church, in her institutions, is forced to give a place, and an important one, to philosophical studies which formerly were avoided. Some of her professors are men of mark. There has been a renewal of philosophical life in her work of apologetics, for which she has never deserved more credit.

Men of note, who were also men of character, have singularly helped this movement. Renouvier — who never held a single official position in the university — who scarcely ever had any personal contact with well-known metaphysicians, except to attack them, often with a violence hardly tempered with courtesy — who antagonised all the moral foibles of his contemporaries, ever holding up the sacredness of “the categorical imperative” — who consecrated his fortune

¹ See Brunschwig, *L'idéalisme contemporain*, 1905; Arréat *Dix années de philosophie*, 1901.

and his life to his philosophical apostleship — wrought a profound change in French philosophy. No man did more than he to fight morbid scepticism and to place philosophical speculations upon an ethical basis.

Lachelier differed from Renouvier in this, that he inspired a whole generation of students of the Superior Normal School of Paris who became uncommon teachers. Paul Janet was for a long time the defender of philosophy against narrow materialists as well as against narrower theologians. He was a brilliant expounder and critic of the thought of others. No one was a more illuminating interpreter of Kant, and no one more luminously applied philosophy to the solution of the burning questions of his time.

The indefatigable Fouillée deserves, with Renouvier, the palm for works of originality, worth, and power. Original from the mere speculative point of view, in his *Idées-forces*, he published important works of historical philosophy. His two books, *Le mouvement positiviste*¹ and *Le mouvement idéaliste*,² gave able discussions of the trend of contemporary French philosophy. Several of his works were masterful and timely. *La psychologie du peuple français*³ and *La France au point de vue moral*⁴ are the best books

¹ 1896.² 1896.³ 1898.⁴ 1900.

available for one who would penetrate into the deepest life of France and understand the French of to-day. Free from national vanity, served by an immense and fresh erudition, inspired by the objective spirit, these volumes are the deepest analyses known to the writer of the ethnographical, the psychological and ethical traits of the nation. His *Esquisse psychologique des peuples européens*,¹ excepting the part devoted to Germany, is a rare study of the traits of the leading peoples of Europe.

Bergson, the eminent professor of the Collège de France, stands out also conspicuously by his strength and originality. No one among contemporary French philosophers is so familiar with the speculations of his own kind or so original in adding to them. His works are not many, but each one of them is exceptional. He has condensed the essence of his thought in his *magnum opus*, *L'évolution créatrice*.² It is the ablest philosophy of evolutionism which has ever been penned by a Frenchman.

These men are only a few in a noble company, among whom we find Lévy-Bruhl, Boutroux, Dauriac, de Séailles, Roherty, G. Lyon, who have done superb service. We should like also to mention Rauh, and above all Auguste

¹ 1903.

² 1908.

Sabatier, who is so inspiring. Among psychologists Ribot stands conspicuous by his personal work of investigation. As a professor of experimental and of comparative psychology he has given a great impulse to such studies in France. "He has contributed more to the psychology of the normal mind than any other French writer," says Dr. M. F. Washburn, but it might be added that by his teaching and his Review he has also kindled a great interest in pathological studies of the mind. Among those who have won great distinction in the same realm we must also mention Pierre Janet, of the Collège de France, and also Georges Dumas at the Sorbonne. It may not be inappropriate to mention here the philosophical interest centring upon the two French schools of mental healing; that of Nancy laying stress upon the physiological side of hypnotism, and that of the Salpêtrière, which emphasized the more profound aspects of suggestive therapeutics. Charcot and his pupils Féré have been conspicuous workers in this field.

One may form an idea of the great number of these philosophers, all called forth by the new life of the Republic, by examining the extensive and varied collections of philosophical works issued by the publisher, F. Alcan, to whom phi-

losophy owes a debt of gratitude for his eminent services. The *Bibliothèque de philosophie scientifique* under M. Gustave Lebon would also offer important works for the same purpose. There are, besides, the philosophical reviews: that of Renouvier and Pillon, *La critique philosophique*, founded in 1872, maintained by the energetic spirit of these two men until 1889; the *Revue philosophique* of M. Ribot started in 1876; the *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* of Xavier Léon begun in 1893. In 1901 was founded the *Institut psychologique*, in which present-day problems are studied by committees and lectures given by French and foreign professors. Reports of its work are given in its *Bulletin*. In 1901 was founded the *Société française de philosophie*. Other groupings for work have been organised. To this we must add the *Année philosophique* of M. Pillon, the *Année psychologique* of Binet, and the *Année sociologique* of M. Durkheim, three publications devoted to three perfectly separate spheres, but all discussing, and discussing ably, philosophical questions.

All these indices of a vigorous philosophical life point to an activity, the extent of which can only be grasped when one remembers the able theses which have been published in the uni-

versities, in the schools of theology, as well as the great bibliography of the philosophical works published during the last forty years. All these manifestations of philosophical energy testify to an intense mental labour, and to a deep transformation of the French mind. It may be fearlessly stated that in these philosophical efforts hardly any part of the speculative domain has been left untouched. The problems of "the whence" and "the whither," of the origin of things, of the laws of human conduct, of the ultimate destiny of man, of the existence or non-existence of God, have been approached with an independence which does not shrink either from fearless affirmation or negation—let us say that negation is the exception rather than the rule.

The true and candid spirit of the leading representatives of the philosophical schools has brought them nearer one another, while among the greater number is seen a concern for moral issues impossible in the days of enthusiasm for the teachings of Taine. In fact the schools have so interpenetrated one another as to have nearly disappeared. M. Gabriel Séailles says: "It is certain that there is at the present hour in France a philosophical movement, a very living thought, very active without our being able to

mark the preponderance of any one system except in a general way. It is the reign of life and of liberty.”¹ This philosophical alertness tends to create a public of philosophical readers. In countries of Protestant culture such a public exists. The free philosophical discussion of all great problems, religious and other, develops an interest which finds expression in wider reading, not stopping at the frontier of the world of intellectual speculations. The new philosophical predilection has certainly deepened the thinking of Frenchmen, arrested the thoughts of many of them upon the great problems of life, and given them a clearer moral consciousness. Philosophical intelligence not only radiates from the schools, from the writings of independent thinkers, but even from much of French contemporary literature and especially from poetry, the drama, and fiction. If now almost every citizen can read, it is a further fact that every public man who is at least a bachelor of letters, a doctor, a lawyer, a pastor, most journalists, and most novelists have more or less philosophy.

One cannot rejoice too much over this growing sway of philosophy; for with the wide and sudden spread of common-school education, the

¹ Private letter to the writer.

remarkable extension of the press, the unprecedented circulation of books, the increase of travel, the military service, and other factors, a whole flood of ill-digested, uncorrelated information was suddenly scattered through the country. This would have brought about a mental chaos which might have been fatal, had not philosophy become a national force of mental order, penetrating in different ways into the various social strata of French democracy. It has singularly modified and lessened the vulgar materialism which comes everywhere with wealth; it has exploded innumerable bubbles of religious or irreligious fanaticism, while it has given a higher rational end to education.

No less significant is the development of sociological studies, carried on in many directions. We see the influence of this activity in works of social reform, in politics, in the newer conceptions of history, of literature and religion. One cannot overlook efforts like those of Edmond Demolins, the author of that well-meant but inadequate book, *A quoi tient la supériorité des Anglo-Saxons?* and of the disciples whom he has grouped around him to continue the work of Le Play for the betterment of society. Through the *Société d'économie sociale*, founded after the Franco-Prussian War, they have done no little

in a conservative way, for social improvement, centring their efforts upon what is to them the great social unit, the family. The large number of monographs upon France, which have been published by the members of this organisation must eventually tell.

The best work is yet done by the sociologists and the economists connected with the institutions of learning. Much more than those just referred to they are animated with the scientific spirit. Abreast of the work of other countries, they have striven to place sociology upon a firmer foundation. Some make it a part of philosophy, others a science; but whatever be their point of view, they propagate sounder conceptions of society and of the best way to improve it. Tarde, who claimed to have found a scientific basis for sociology in the laws of imitation, made his countrymen do much thinking. Durkheim has done brilliant work, and edited that rich and suggestive publication, the *Année sociologique*. Gide, much better known abroad than at home, is one of the ablest, social investigators and social workers of Europe. Bouglé combines the qualities of German scholarship with the best traits of French savants. He wrought clearly and profoundly in the problems of modern society. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, the eminent pro-

fessor at the Collège de France and editor of *L'économiste français*, adds to his claims as a scientist a remarkable record of intelligence and courage, when he was the only journalistic voice in France protesting against the Panama iniquities.

Outside of the educational world, yet closely in touch with it, are able economists affecting the nation through journalism. Among them we should mention Yves Guyot who has taken a noble stand in all questions, and been the friend ever of economic liberty; Alfred Neymarck, editor of *Le Rentier*, and Edmond Théry, editor of *L'économiste européen*, men whose point of view may not be ours, but whose vital influence cannot be overlooked. The leading characteristic of literature, art, and philosophy during the last forty years has been the manifestation of astounding energy.

CHAPTER VI

THE NEW ACTIVITY IN HISTORY AND SCIENCE

THE progress of the historical sciences has been epoch-making. The most important need for progress in this realm is absolute freedom of inquiry, opportunities of research as well as of investigation, and freedom of speech. The Republic has furnished them all. Investigators have been so free that many of them in official positions have not infrequently expressed conclusions quite at variance with those of their chiefs concerning historical points bearing upon the controversies between Church and State. During a stay of one year in Paris the writer saw, in the National Library, in the National Archives, and even in the Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the bitter opponents of the Republic treated in every way like other investigators. Under this régime, as under the preceding, historians have enjoyed much consideration, and several of them have

been placed at the head of important ministries. In the Ministry of Public Instruction there has been a considerable enlargement of organisations to further the cause of history. The historical commission of that Ministry continues its rich collection of documents. The government helps particular historians, either by furnishing the assistance needed for special work, or by publishing their books through the National Printing Press, or in some other manner. Numerous historical chairs have been founded. At times cities have joined with the government in this work; the city of Paris has founded several chairs of history. Important fellowships in history have been established.¹

There has never been a greater sense of the importance of working from sources. A noble emulation has arisen in the publication of documents by the government, by the academies, by cities, and by historical societies, that are now to be counted by the hundred. For one of these under the Empire there are now ten. They have accumulated material upon a colossal scale for the subjects to which they are devoted. French historians have never been so extensively associated, either as corporate or as corresponding members, with foreign historical societies.

¹ *Bourses de licence d'histoire.*

Government help was never given more generously than now. The Parliament voted 500,000 francs for the excavations at Delphi, so admirably carried on by M. Homolle. In other parts of Greece, in Asia, and in North Africa extensive works of a kindred nature have compelled unknown history to yield some of her secrets. Similarly in different parts of France, and under various auspices, traces have been sought of prehistoric life, and remains of the buried cities of Gaul have been uncovered. Cartailhac and De Mortillet have, by their labours, recast our ethnological conceptions of the French people and given a further and more real retrospect to French history.

Not only have mediæval, modern, and contemporary history been studied in all their phases, but French historians have shown great interest in Celtic, Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Arabic, Indian studies, not to speak of others which show more and more that the field of history is the world. In addition to the historical schools of France in Rome, in Athens, and in Cairo, as well as the institutional efforts made in North Africa, a French School of the Far-East has been started in Indo-China. Wherever the French flag has been planted the claims of history have not been overlooked.

Never has the country been more fertile in historians of a high order. Renan, Taine, Lavissee, Gabriel Monod, Sorel, Hanotaux, Rambaud, Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu are not only masters in various ways, but Lavissee and Monod remain great historical teachers. Gabriel Monod not only founded the *Revue historique* and organised the *Société historique*, but formed a goodly number of distinguished pupils, like him inspired by the purest scientific spirit and a strict sense of loyalty to facts. Most of them follow at any cost the objective method.

The chief end of history for reputable French historians is truth and truth only. Some of them seem indifferent to national prejudices, and have stated, with the resoluteness of prophets, facts which were offensive to national pride. Sorel and Lavissee have been conspicuous in this respect. The thoroughness, the synthetic character, and the scientific objectivity of French history are more and more evident. One of the striking features of this French activity is the small army of searchers who are everywhere exploring the past of men and things with a common purpose of increasing human knowledge. The Republic has, with freedom, furnished the tools for this great collective inquiry, rewarded those who have sketched its

results in the best manner, and helped not a little the popularisation of historical works.

History has never had such a large place in the primary and secondary schools and in the universities. The manuals of historical teaching have been so improved that the text-books of the Empire and those used now do not seem to be by or for the same people. French libraries give proportionally a larger place to history than those of America, and the relative number of historical works read is also greater. Of course there are still men who write history in the interest of peculiar cliques; but the genuine historical spirit has so penetrated into the nation's life, that one finds its beneficent influence in ecclesiastical historiography and in hagiographic literature, domains where formerly it was signally wanting.

Outside of the almost endless bibliography of historical works published under the Republic, one may have an idea of the place which history has taken in the national life from the fact that there are few Reviews of a general character which do not give to it an important place. One may draw the same conclusion from the new historical Reviews — taking the term *historical* in the largest sense possible. Among others we have *Romania*, founded in 1871; *Bulletin de la*

société des anciens textes, in 1875; *La Revue historique*, 1876; *Le Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, 1877; *Revue épigraphique*, 1878; *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 1880; *Revue égyptologique*, *Revue des études juives*, *Revue de la Révolution française*, 1881; *Répertoire des travaux historiques*, *Revue de la Révolution*, 1883; *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*, 1886; *Revue des traditions populaires*, *Revue des études grecques*, 1888; *Revue historique et héraldique*, *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, 1893, *Revue d'histoire littéraire*, 1894; and *Gazette numismatique française*, 1897. In this new vogue of history, as in the other manifestations of the national life which we have studied, the increased prestige and influence of science is seen.

The pride of Republicans soars high when they speak of the scientific achievements of Frenchmen. They cannot but draw a very striking contrast between the scientific equipment of France under the Empire and that of to-day. Pasteur speaks of the place where the great French physiologist, Claude Bernard, worked, as a laboratory "half cellar, half tomb,"¹ the "hovel,"² "a damp and low cellar."³ His own was for a long time but an attic, and one of

¹ Valléry-Radot, *La vie de Pasteur*, 1900, p. 216.

² *Ibid.*, p. 661.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 667.

scanty proportions, which would excite the contempt of teachers of chemistry in our humblest high school. Even later on, his laboratory in the *École normale supérieure* consisted of only two small rooms. This great scientist waxes eloquent when he sees the superb laboratories of the Sorbonne opened twenty years ago. In a moment of grateful enthusiasm he exclaims, "Everything from the schools of the villages to the laboratories of advanced science has been either founded or renovated."¹ The same movement has been continued since his death. Laboratories of all kinds have been established. The Faculty of Sciences has 20 at the Sorbonne, and 24 scattered in Paris, all devoted to teaching and to research.² There are 10 in the Faculty of Medicine, 28 at the Practical School of High Studies,³ 20 at the *Collège de France*, 7 at the National Agronomic Institute, not to speak of those located in different parts of the land. There are some also in the colonies. The Pasteur Institute is but an immense laboratory studying pathology in all its forms. There are those of Zoology, with stations at Roscoff in Brittany, at Boulogne, Villefranche, Marseilles and Cette. There are also those of Vegeta

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 656.

² *Livret de l'étudiant*, 1908-1909, p. 43.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

Biology at Fontainebleau, and of Geology at Lille. It was of the creation of most of these laboratories that Pasteur spoke, when he referred to what had been "founded and renovated."

We are far from the time when he laments the fact that Napoleon can find millions to build the Opera, but cannot find "between sixty and one hundred thousand francs" to equip a laboratory.¹ There was not then in the budget of the Ministry of Public Instruction one centime devoted to the physical sciences by means of laboratories.² The laboratory idea has also been extended to subjects which formerly seemed out of its scope, experimental psychology, for instance. Recently a congress of French teachers asked that these psychological laboratories be introduced into all the normal schools for the future teachers of the common education. One may say that the laboratory method has been generalised.

Other instruments also of scientific progress have been created. An important astronomical observatory was established at Meudon, another at Mont Blanc, one at the Pic-du-Midi, one on the Puy-de-Dôme, and one in Nice which has a very exceptional equipment. A separation took place between the astronomical and meteorologi-

¹ Valléry-Radot, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

² *Ibid.*, p. 216.

cal work, which has brought about the creation of the *Bureau central de météorologie*, another name for a weather bureau which has rendered vast services to agriculture and to navigation. The scientific missions can scarcely be counted which have been sent to almost every part of the world for the furtherance of knowledge, and an increasing number of agencies teach the results of these scientific efforts.

We have already referred to those new scientific societies and their varied annual publications which are increasing with specialisation and the tendency to turn results of science into practical channels. There has also been the publication of those periodicals which give yearly surveys of the whole field of one or of several sciences, such as the *Année biologique*, the *Année psychologique*, the *Année sociologique*, the *Annuaire de la société d'ethnographie*, the *Annuaire géologique universel*, which are as invaluable for specialists as for the man of the world who wishes to be acquainted with the work done in these domains. Of 299 publications devoted to the subject of health, that is, medicine, surgery, and hygiene, 225 were started under the Republic, representing a gain of 300 per cent. Of the 19 papers on metallurgy, 10 are of recent creation, and of the 84 scientific papers, 56, that is 200

per cent, were started during the last forty years.¹

In every part of the country private individuals have pursued scientific studies on their own account, while French travellers, missionaries, and officers in the colonies have rendered manifest services by their observations and discoveries. There has been kindled a spirit of scientific apostleship, which has found expression in many ways, but especially in the organisation of societies and clubs with scientific ends in view. Of the 64 learned societies in Paris mentioned by *Minerva* with the date of their foundation, 29 were started before the Republic and 35 after. Of course these are only a few out of the total number of such Parisian societies. The proportion of learned associations formed in other parts of the country is as encouraging, while the development of the scientific spirit has been constant. Any one who compares the programme of the *Congrès scientifique* of Chartres, in September, 1869,² with the last session of the *Association française pour l'avancement des sciences* will be struck by the change which has taken place. The topics of religious archæology, of ecclesiastical history, and of Church interests

¹ *Annuaire de la presse française et étrangère*, 1909.

which were formerly dominant, have yielded their places to the discussion of the vital problems of our age. This association has done much for "the progress and diffusion of the sciences."

A state institution, the *Caisse des recherches scientifiques*, was founded by the Ministry of Public Instruction in 1900 to accumulate funds to further scientific activity. This organisation, is likely in course of time to have a large income at its disposal. The French Institute grants every three years the prize of 100,000 francs known as *Prix Osiris*, to the Frenchman who has signally contributed to the progress of science, or produced the most useful work, not to speak of Osiris' royal gift of 20,000,000 or 22,000,000 to the Pasteur Institute. M. Albert Kahn, a most generous benefactor of French education in the past, has just pledged 30,000 francs a year, for five years, to the purpose inviting foreign scientists of note to go to Paris as lecturers, or for Frenchmen to go to other countries for the purpose of expounding their own discoveries.

Les Amis du Muséum give their sympathy and support to that institution, as other friends do with scientific establishments in other parts of the country. The Academy of Sciences, that

of Medicine, and that of Moral and Political Sciences have numerous rewards in their keeping for scientific workers. Furthermore, these bodies enjoy, on the part of the most advanced citizens and of those in power, a consideration which was singularly wanting under the last Empire. They have free speech now. All bodies representing science have contributed to promote more and more a sense of the kinship of all forms of knowledge, of the unity of all truths and of all sciences. The mathematical, the physical, the historical, the sociological, and the psychological sciences are all intrinsic parts of the same great field of science and are all interdependent. Everywhere we find among scientific workers the idea that, whatever one's legitimate theories and hypotheses may be, these must ultimately rest upon observation and experiment.

By the side of this empiricism there is also found an idealism which leads these workers to the conviction that, whatever be the utilitarian value of this great collective labour for material or for moral ends, science should be studied for its own sake. In forming a moral estimate of France one should not forget this scientific idealism which is an important asset in ethical reckonings, nor the general faith in the

beneficence of knowledge. Along with this has come a national feeling of gratitude to scientists of the past. Those who, like Lamarck and other forgotten scientific workers, toiled for truth without recognition in their day, have now their statues or other memorials. Nor should we forget the men who within forty years have distinguished themselves in particular sections of the scientific field. In mathematics, Darboux's *Leçons sur la théorie générale des surfaces* "is unrivalled." Picard is recognised by leading mathematicians as having made uncommon contributions to their science. Poincaré, apart from his contributions to mathematics and to mathematical physics, has propounded his theory of our planetary system which is the most important since Laplace, and he has established with much greater precision and rigor the permanence of our solar system. With Tisserand and Loewy he has won a well-deserved recognition in astronomy. Since the days of Fontenelle no one has succeeded as well as Flammarion in popularising the data and problems of that science. Becquerelle and Lipmann are admitted to be great physicists, one making important additions to our knowledge of radiography, and the other, by following certain optical principles, discovering coloured photography.

Let Dr. Harvey M. Wiley, of the Department of Agriculture at Washington, give us his estimate of French work in a realm in which he has a recognised eminence. "One naturally turns to Berthelot in speaking of French chemists of modern times. Since the death of Chevreul he has been *facile princeps* among French chemists. Berthelot's activity in all branches of chemical science distinguishes him among chemists, who usually are masters only in some one department of science. Berthelot was a master in all. . . . Almost as eminent as Berthelot was that great worker, Moissan, whose untimely death lost to French chemistry one of its most brilliant representatives. His work, of course, was chiefly inorganic chemistry, and his synthetic preparation of the precious stones under the influence of the electric furnace is a distinct step forward in the progress of chemistry."¹ "Before Moissan," says Dr. Edward Renouf, of Johns Hopkins, "the study of chemical reactions had been confined to temperatures between 50 degrees below and 1,200 degrees above zero centigrade. Moissan invented the electric furnace . . . in which 3,000 degrees centigrade are attainable, temperatures comparable with that of the sun. His studies of chemical reactions at high tem-

¹ Letter, Feb. 16, 1910.

peratures opened up a new field for chemical research, and are especially valuable to astronomy by indicating the probable chemical reactions and condition of matter in the sun and in the stars, and to geology by showing the complex changes in the composition of matter which must have occurred in the gradual cooling of the earth. Moissan was also one of the first chemists to utilise liquid air as a refrigerant, in the study of chemical reactions at extremely low temperatures, and devised ingenious apparatus for his purpose.”¹

In the “brilliant array” of French chemists we must not fail to mention M. and Mme. Curie. “It is a rare combination,” says again Dr. Wiley, “to see husband and wife equally eminent in the most difficult and recondite branches of chemical investigations. The world was shocked by the accidental death of M. Curie, but it has been no less surprised at the brilliant work of Madame Curie since her husband’s death. It is not because of a feeling of gallantry, but of real accomplishment, that the chemical world bows before Madame Curie. . . . The examples I have mentioned are only types of brilliant and magnificent work of French chemists during the past third of a century.

The Republic, since its establishment on the fourth of September, 1870, may feel proud of what has been accomplished in chemical science. Adolph Wurtz, one of the most brilliant of French chemists of modern times, declared that chemistry is a French science, founded by Lavoissier of immortal memory. The French chemists of the Republic have well illustrated the fact that chemistry is also a continuing French science.”¹

Pasteur did a large amount of work as a chemist for which he never received any credit; but he is accounted everywhere one of the greatest figures of the scientific world. He effectively opened the new world of invisible life, opened the way for Lister's great antiseptic work, practically saved French sericulture, found a scientific way to exterminate anthrax, and finally made his last great discovery of anti-rabies vaccine. The frequency of hydrophobia in Europe gave a greater significance to his cure for one of the most dreaded of diseases. His great contribution to science does not consist in this or that particular discovery, but in the fundamental new principles which he introduced into medicine, surgery, hygiene, and the sciences of life. There is not a civilised country where

¹ Dr. H. M. Wiley, *ibid.*

natural sciences were not affected by the principles which he discovered. He gave France the example of an eminent scientist ready to fight courageously for the rights of science against theologians, while opposing scientists when they exceeded the proper limits of their realm. He had the courage in the French Academy to assert that, beyond the visible, he had seen what to him was the evidence of a certain supernatural, for which the world had found personal symbols, whether they were a Buddha or a Jesus.

Several men were directly inspired by the teachings of Pasteur. There is Roux producing the anti-diphtheric vaccine, and Calmette his anti-venomous serum against the sting of venomous animals. We might add to these names those of Duclaux, Metchnikoff, Yersin, and others.¹ Armand Sabatier, enlarging upon his conclusions as a naturalist, and lifting them up to a high philosophical plane, has discussed with great originality some of the most fundamental problems of human existence.² Gaudry has not only an eminent rank in vertebrate paleontology, but his philosophical culture enabled him to

¹ Vallery-Radot, *op. cit.*, p. 673 *et seq.*

² See *Essai sur la vie et la mort*, 1892; *Essai sur l'immortalité au point de vue du naturalisme évolutioniste*, 1895; *Philosophie de l'effort*, 1903.

draw valuable cosmological deductions from his studies.¹ "Lapparent," writes Dr. Rice of Wesleyan University, "stands in the first rank among all-round geologists." The late German paleontologist, von Zittel, told him that Lapparent's *Geology* was "the best book on geology in existence." Fouqué and Michel-Lévy have taken foremost places in the comparatively new department of microscopic petrography. Anthropology and ethnography have acquired an interest which would have been impossible under Napoleon. Broca did most of his work under the Republic. Then we have Topinard, De Quatrefages, and Hamy, who have won laurels in this singularly interesting field, in which we must also place Fouillée, not as a specialist, but as one who has subjected the conclusions of ethnologists and anthropologists to the severest philosophical tests. Medicine and surgery in France as compared with the outer world may not have the place of unique distinction which they had forty years ago; but competent Americans assert that these two sciences — in so far as they are sciences — have made enormous progress there.

It is greatly to the credit of French scientists

¹ See *Enchaînements du monde animal dans les temps géologiques*, 1878-1883; *Essai de paléontologie philosophique*.

that they should have so intimately co-ordinated themselves with those of the whole world. For them science ignores frontiers, and the best attitude is that which is ever ready to assimilate new knowledge, whatever be its source. Foreign countries have honoured them. In 1890 Henri Poincaré, at the Universal Congress of Mathematics in Stockholm, was awarded the Medal of Honor. M. and Mme. Curie, Henri Becquerel, Moissan, Laveran, Lipmann, and Metchnikoff — the latter a Russian who has become thoroughly French — have received Nobel prizes. At the seventh International Zoological Congress, in Boston, August, 1909, the Czar Nicholas Prize was awarded to Prof. L. Cuénot of Paris for his work on heredity. Foreign governments and universities have given similar and flattering recognition. Highly cultivated at home, French science radiates abroad. It is no longer the tolerated, neglected, and suspected study of four decades ago, coming in the scheme of education after the languages, with its spectacular experiments as mere shows for the students; science now is preponderant. It is fundamental in education and in other important realms of life. It is a power with which theology and philosophy must reckon. It has come to be written with a large S. For many, science has become a

kind of religion. It is the great, noisy idol of Republicans with its enthusiastic devotees and even with its fanatics; a beneficent idol, however, freeing the land from ignorance, from superstitions, from needless terrors, and putting new energy into every organ of the nation's life.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL REFORM AND PHILANTHROPY

THE national energy has also displayed itself in the domain of social improvement and philanthropy. The men in power have rendered their best services in this realm by showing an untiring solicitude for those who contribute so potently to the creation of wealth, the labouring classes. A very important departure, under the Republic, has been the creation of a Superior Council of Labour in connection with the Ministry of Commerce — a council which furnishes the Parliament with trustworthy data and reliable statistics on labour and on needed legislation. The establishment of a Labour Exchange in Paris, subsequently aided with a grant of 3,000,000 francs, and the foundation of 125 other exchanges¹ in large cities, indicate a real concern for the welfare of the masses. Clemenceau went further. He

founded a Ministry of Labour, marking, thereby, a new era in the history of French institutions.

The government has favoured the formation of labour-unions of all kinds, and under conditions more beneficial for toilers. These have not infrequently been abusive when in trades-unions, cruel in strikes, and criminal in the senseless destruction of property; but as a whole the labour movement has meant greater independence, a clearer consciousness of the rights of the labourer, and a certain education resulting from his desire to co-ordinate himself properly with his economic environments. His employers are no longer the baronial lords of the Second Empire, who acted as if they owned his soul. He is no more haunted by the fear of losing his position because of his vote or his Church.

A fact which shows the improvement in his condition is that the legislation of the last forty years has been mostly in his favour. The Parliament has passed laws on liability of employers in case of accidents, laws providing reliable inspectors for the security of the labourer in mines, laws to free workingmen from the *livret*, a book of identity placing the labourer at the mercy of his employer, laws preventing a child from working in factories unless provided with a certificate from some doctor that the labour is not

above his strength, laws instituting juvenile courts, laws limiting the time of women's and children's labour as well as of labour in general, laws promoting arbitration between employers and employees, laws and appropriations to help the organisation of mutual-benefit societies, to further the state system of annuities to labourers by the payment of an annual fee, laws providing for old-age pensions. One of the laws which was most violently combated by the opposition is that which accords to every French labourer the inalienable right to have one day of rest every week, and that on Sunday wherever it is not impracticable. There is scarcely any limit to the legal efforts made in this direction. M. Paul Deschanel did not exaggerate when, at a banquet in Paris, he said recently, "The Republic has done more in thirty years for the workingman than the other régimes during several centuries."¹

At the same time, changed conditions, as we show elsewhere,² have brought an increase of wages and a lower cost of the necessities of life.

One of the leading factors in this improvement has been the organisation of labour-unions, which had a precarious existence under the third Bonaparte, but in 1905 had 11,841 *syndicates* of dif-

¹ *Le Temps*, Nov. 26, 1909.

² See chap. X, p. 192.

ferent kinds with at least 1,809,498 members.¹ They exert an important moral and social influence. In 1905, 961 of these unions had employment bureaus; 1,059, libraries; 816, funds for mutual help; 690, funds for those without work, and 348 have professional schools or professional courses.² The labourers of the country are put in touch with opportunities for work by means of numerous employment bureaus, by labour exchanges, by trades-unions, by municipal councils, by mutual-aid societies as well as by benevolent boards.

The idea of profit sharing is represented by such admirable institutions as that of Godin in Guise, and that of Boucicaut at the Bon-Marché in Paris; but while in 1870 there were only 16 institutions practising it, in 1900 there were 120.³ The co-operative societies, only 39 in 1870, had in 1899 reached the number of 1,418, with sales of 73,000,000 francs. During 1898 twelve of these societies did a business of more than half a million, six of more than a million, and one reached the figure of 5,500,000.⁴ The savings-banks had issued 2,360,000 bank-books with 660,000,000 of deposits in 1875;

¹ *Annuaire statistique.*

² *L'Illustration.* Documents, Nov. 11, 1905.

³ *Catalogue officiel de l'exposition universelle, 1900, vol. XVI.*

but in 1905 there were 12,100,000 bank-books with deposits of 4,650,000,000. The Republic founded postal savings-banks and school savings-banks, which have done much to foster thrifty habits. A frequent reward in the common schools is a bank-book. Besides those founded by government there are municipal and private savings-banks with 42,000 depositors, having 47,000,000 in deposits.¹ There are also associations like *La Fourmi* (The Ant), founded in 1879, in which depositors are pledged to pay so much per week or per month. At the end of a certain time a division is made. Before 1900 this society had collected 27,000,000 francs.

Organisations to provide against the contingencies of life meet more and more with popular patronage. The Second Empire gave some encouragement to mutual-aid societies. In 1871 there were 5,787 of them with a membership of 683,974 and a capital of 36,000,000 francs, while in 1903 there were 16,297 such societies with a membership of 3,211,890 and a capital of 406,000,000 francs.² As these societies provide free medical service for their members it was feared lest the law, which compels the town to give free medical care to the needy

¹ Bliss, *The Encyclopedia of Social Reform*, p. 1094.

² *Annuaire statistique*.

poor, would be fatal to mutual-aid societies; but these fears were groundless, and these organisations increased. As the number of patients helped by the towns augmented, the members of the societies of mutual aid became more numerous. The town-helped patients, from 1895 to 1899, rose from 360,000 to 500,000, and the members of mutual-aid societies from 1,354,439 to 1,759,000.¹ School mutual-aid societies are of recent formation. In 1894 there were three in Paris and one in the country; now 705,000 children belong to them, paying dues amounting, in 1906, to 4,000,000 francs.² In 1909 there were 800,000 members.³ M. Léopold Mabillean, an enthusiastic worker in this direction, sets at 21,000 all the mutual-aid societies and at about 5,000,000 the number of mutualists of France.⁴

The idea of old-age pensions has been more and more put into practice. The number of beneficiaries from the State have increased from 130,103 in 1871 to 245,257 in 1905, and the sums paid, from 83,000,000 to 230,000,000 francs.⁵

¹ Comte d'Haussonville, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, vol. 162, p. 792.

² *Le Temps*, Aug. 2, 1906.

³ *Le Siècle*, Feb. 23, 1909. In these societies the pupils pay two cents a week. One is used to help sick members, and the other to provide an old-age pension in due time. The *mutualités scolaires* are followed by *mutualités post-scolaires*, which interest the pupil until he may join an adult society.

⁴ *Le Siècle*, Feb. 1, 1909.

⁵ *Annuaire statistique*.

The government grants pensions to old soldiers, to aged public servants, to functionaries, and to teachers as well as to some seamen permanently liable to service in the navy. The State also compels miners to provide for old age by surrendering 2 per cent of their wages. This is duplicated by the employer and also by the country. In 1907 the Chamber of Deputies voted an old-age pension for labourers, which has been lately ratified by the Senate.

Public opinion has moved so rapidly in this direction that many corporations of their own accord have put the principles of this law into practice and provided old-age pensions for 1,200,000 employees. The seven great railroad companies of France, in 1906, devoted 67,000,000 francs to old-age pensions for their 200,000 servants.¹ The Bank of France not only provides pensions and encourages the mutual-aid societies of its employees, but in 1908 it founded a *Société de prévoyance dotale*, a society to provide the children of employees with a dowry at the time of their marriage.² The sum devoted by this institution to improve the condition of its *personnel* is 2,500,000 francs a year. Furthermore, the State has an organisation whereby any

¹ Yves Guyot, *Le Siècle*, Dec. 15, 1908.

² *La Revue*, Jan. 1, 1909, p. 126.

individual may secure an old-age annuity by the payment of annual fees. The number of individuals who avail themselves, of this institution is not large. In 1898 only 29,245 persons made payments for themselves, while the total number of beneficiaries was 235,184; that is, the greater part is paid by employers. The annuities paid that year amounted to 34,458,491 francs.

Insurance companies having an annuity service reimbursed that year 75,000,000 francs in the same direction. Insurance companies have greater success with individuals who subscribe on their own account; for, from 1882 to 1898 their annuity service increased 300 per cent. Life insurance has had a prodigious development. From 1870 to 1898 the policies rose from 10,162¹ to 522,066, and the amounts insured from 141,500,000 to 3,905,000,000 francs.² This reaches not only the rich and the well-to-do, but also people of limited means. Well-conducted life insurance appeals more and more to labourers, and the possibility of making small and frequent payments has contributed to the increase in the number of policies.

Rent-paying people are not so numerous as in

¹ *La Grande Encyclopédie*, vol. IV, "Assurance."

² *Catalogue officiel*, *ibid.*

many countries, for a majority of Frenchmen own their own homes, yet in some centres a large part of the poor population live in wretched quarters. The providing of healthy homes, a work taken up with apostolic zeal by M. Jules Siegfried, and now pushed forward by over 100 building associations,¹ will save workingmen from living in hovels where health as well as decency is impossible. The *Alliance d'hygiène sociale* and the *Société française des habitations à bon marché* have inspired many a poor workman to make efforts to have a house of his own, or to have a building association erect it. There is also the work of the *Société anonyme de logements économiques pour familles nombreuses*, providing inexpensive apartments for families with numerous children.²

Along this line may be mentioned the work of the Mining Society of Lens, which, in 1900, had already built 3,637 houses for its operatives; the princely gift of 10,000,000 francs from the Rothschilds to build large, comfortable, and inexpensive blocks of houses for the better class of artisans and clerks; the *Hôtel meublé*, constructed by the *Société philanthropique* for single

¹ *Ibid.*

² No family of less than three children may be admitted. The Society is pledged not to pay more than 3 per cent to its stockholders. *Le Signal*, Oct. 29, 1907.

women;¹ the *Logement pour dames des postes, télégraphes et téléphones*, a home for the women employed in post-offices;² and *La Parisienne*, a large home founded by the Comte d'Haussonville, in which 150 young women may live for 25 francs per month.

The general problem, as well as the specific one, of housing has been taken up all over the country. By the side of the poor are people in humble circumstances, who are received in the *maisons de retraite*—a term which Miss Betham-Edwards has translated very appropriately “associated homes.” There are homes in large seaports for sailors, so that, while ashore, they may be under good influence. We might speak of *L’Abri*, “The Shelter,” a society to help the worthy poor who through misfortune are unable to pay their rent. The object of this organisation is to stay eviction. Some 290 agencies put within the reach of 15,000 families small, free gardens where they may grow the vegetables they need.³

The matter of sanitation has been taken up with earnestness and determination. Strict laws have conferred adequate powers upon those who have special care of the hygiene of the country.

¹ *L’Illustration*, June 7, 1902.

² *Ibid*, July 22, 1905.

³ *Le Siècle*, Nov. 9, 1909.

Scientific methods of arresting contagious diseases are rapidly accepted by the masses. Cities have made great sacrifices to obtain pure water, and plenty of it. Narrow, unhealthy streets are replaced by improved ones. There has never been such a destruction of hovels as during the last forty years. Almost everywhere the tendency is to give more place to houses, sometimes at the cost of fine, historic streets or of walls which are dismantled. The hygienist scarcely stops before important monumental landmarks.

The work against tuberculosis has been created by the Republic. Not to speak of institutions inland, in 1901 there were 24 sanitariums on the coasts.¹ That of Hendaye, in the Pyrénées is a model institution. By the side of other agencies to fight this evil, in 1908, *L'Œuvre de la tuberculose humaine* gave 400,000 free consultations to tuberculous patients.² Through the new education the people have come to believe in the power of microbes, and also in that of science. Saint Hubert, formerly the only hope of those bitten by mad dogs, has been replaced by the Pasteur Institute. The 2,671 cases treated in 1886 had a death-rate of 0.94 per cent, while in 1900 the 1,420 cases were fatal only to the

¹ Conference of Charities, 1902, p. 228.

² *Le Siècle*, Feb. 1, 1909.

extent of 0.28 per cent.¹ The awful disease anthrax, so fatal to beasts and often to men, is rapidly diminishing through the Pasteur vaccination of cattle.

Innumerable efforts have been made to save human life, laying stress upon the harrowing problem of infantile mortality. The recent *Foundation Pierre Budin* is a practical school for the care and treatment of babies. There, apart from the teaching of the mothers and the advice given to them in individual cases, the little ones are weighed, examined periodically, and their diet is superintended. It is a noble attempt to popularise our best knowledge among those who, hitherto, have been led only by impulse and often merely by instinct. Laws enacted under the Republic protect babies from those monstrous provincial nurses, who had earned the only too appropriate name of *faiseuses d'anges*, "angel makers," because of the large death-rate of the infants committed to their charge. The Roussel law prevents these women from going out until their own infants are at least seven months old. Dispensaries have become numerous, while relief at home has been greatly extended.

The total expense for hospitals, asylums, and

¹ *L'Illustration*, Documents, July 13, 1901.

homes for the aged has risen from 99,000,000 francs in 1871¹ to 157,000,000 in 1904.² Aged people, the infirm and the incurable are taken care of by the State. The Republic has co-ordinated the town, the department, and the State organisations, and thereby has accelerated their action through the *Assistance publique*. The expenses of all local boards of charity, superintended by this national instrument, were 26,000,000 francs in 1871 and 46,000,000 in 1907. The average annual gift to chartered benevolent institutions was between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 francs from 1800 to 1855, and 22,000,000 francs from 1874 to 1884.³ In the hospitals and *hospices*, old people's homes, the patients have increased from 52,232 in 1871 to 59,814 in 1905,⁴ the inmates of hospices proper from 48,149 to 69,000, and the expenses have risen from 82,000,000 francs to 168,000,000. The children in these institutions have increased from 64,550 to 123,235, and the expenses from 10,000,000 francs to 34,000,000.⁵

Abbé Gayraud sets at 100,000 the number of the sick, the infirm, and the aged, and at 60,000 the orphans, in Roman Catholic institutions.⁶

¹ Fernandez, *op. cit.*, p. 354.

² *The Statesman's Year Book*, 1907.

³ *Catalogue officiel*, *ibid.*

⁴ *Annuaire statistique*.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *La République et la vie religieuse* n. 92

There are small independent organisations for particular cases such as the *Association générale des Alsaciens* and the *Société de protection des Alsaciens*, which have spent more than 3,000,000 francs each for this form of charity in twenty years.¹ There is *La Maison Rossini* for aged artists, and *La Maison des comédiens* at Port-aux-dames, for aged actors. There are professional associations, providing orphanages for fatherless or motherless children of their organisation. There are institutions of this kind for artists' children, for the children of common-school teachers, for those of railroad employees, for those of Alsatians, for those of Free-masons, etc. Comte d'Haussonville sets at 1,400 the number of independent orphanages—the majority of them Catholic—in the country.²

The increase in the number of institutions and the number of their inmates does not mean an increase of the needy, but that more of the needy are now helped who formerly were neglected. Innumerable efforts are made to protect infants at home, from the institutions that furnish pure milk to those which take them away from cruel parents. The *crèches* are doing good work, but they labour against the popular feel-

¹ Scheurer-Kestner, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

² *Revue des Deux Mondes*, vol. clxi, p. 787.

ing that what the children need is not more institutions, but more mothers restored to them by better social conditions. The same thing might be said about the *garderies* of children in the schools where the little ones are kept under proper supervision until the mothers return home from their work. In many of the schools *cantines scolaires* provide lunch for all at cost, and free for poor, under-fed children;¹ and summer outings take poor children to the country. When possible the rule is to scatter them in homes rather than place them in large aggregations. The *Société pour la protection de l'enfance abandonnée et coupable* has extended its kind ministrations to more than 10,000 children,² while religious organisations deserve much credit for kindred work. Public opinion has moved in the direction of greater kindness toward illegitimate children, formerly treated like moral pariahs, as if they were responsible for the sins of their parents. Laws also have been voted to secure greater justice for them in the matter of inheritance.

As we have already seen, under the Republic the nation has strongly modified its attitude

¹ In 1904, the schools of Paris served 10,660,000 meals. (Sir John E. Gorst, *The Children of the Nation*.)

² *La Revue*, Jan. 1, 1909, p. 125.

toward woman. As a girl, she has more education in the schools, more protection in the mill, and in the street. Her status is as yet far from ideal, but the progress has been great. There are now works like the *Œuvre pour la répression de la traite des blanches* to fight organised prostitution; works to help young girls arriving in Paris, giving temporary help and sound advice; institutions to shelter them overnight; others where the fallen may, and some do, reform. Numerous organisations provide an inexpensive meal for shop girls; and one of the organisations, the *Réfectoire*, recently established, aims to furnish free meals to honest working girls without work. There are homes on the seashore for worn-out mothers. The *mutualités maternelles*, the labour exchanges for mothers, the *Asile Michelet*, the *Comité du refuge pour femmes enceintes*, the purpose of which is to relieve from hard work those who are about to become mothers, to free them from too exacting cares, or to enable them to gain strength before childbirth. The thought here is as much the well-being of the expected offspring as that of the mother. There is the *Asile George Sand* where, after their confinement, they may be received with their children, and the *Asile Ledru-Rollin* when they have one child only. If they cannot

support their child, it is received temporarily at the *Asile Léo-Delibes* or permanently elsewhere. The *Fondation Carnot* distributes annually sums of 200 francs each to worthy widows with children. They had 99 beneficiaries in 1909.

No less important than what is done for women is what women are now doing for all, through their innumerable societies for social service. The *Société française de secours aux blessés*, though founded under the Empire, has received a signal development under the Republic. The new organisations, the *Association des dames françaises* and the *Union des femmes de France*, had for their first work the care of the wounded, but they widened their aims to the relief of suffering in every direction. Their services during the recent flood in Paris excited the admiration of all. The advent of lay women workers, which has lately been so striking, is one of the most evident marks of philanthropic progress under the Republic. One could never have dreamed four decades ago that there was so much latent altruism in the nation. It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the extent and variety of works of relief, from the sanitarium for teachers to the *bouchée de pain*, bread distribution to the hungry; relief by work; help to families of shipwrecked seamen. and to liberated prisoners.

Much has been done outside of the new education, of the more popular artistic culture, of the new legal and scientific environments to elevate the masses. The *Laboratoires Bourbouze* are free laboratories placed at the disposal of workingmen for the study of physics, chemistry, electricity, photography, and micrography.¹ The *Universités populaires*, a species of workingmen's colleges, furnish an admirable complementary education for labourers, though it may be added that they have not been entirely successful. Libraries have become more numerous, lectures more frequent,² and they are almost always illustrated.

There are, moreover, the temperance societies, clubs of all kinds, from the Ultramontane clubs of M. de Mun³ to those of extreme radicalism, the Young Men's Christian Associations,⁴ the work of *Les amis des foyers du soldat* which is establishing popular clubs where soldiers during their hours of leisure may find a home,

¹ *Livret de l'étudiant*, 1908-1909, p. 137.

² Under the Empire it was difficult to secure permission to give these lectures, and when they were given, a representative of the police was present, and that, as a rule, at the expense of those who wished the lecture.

³ Mun (Comte A. de), *Questions sociales, Discours politiques, Discours et écrits divers*.

⁴ These have been brought to their present state of efficiency through the generosity and guidance of Mr. James Stokes of New York.

the societies of patronage for apprentices and for youth in general, gymnastic societies for national physical culture, musical associations both choral and instrumental, tending in a general way to social elevation. Many of these organisations are the work of the toilers themselves. They have shown power of grouping, of social affinities and a spirit of social service, which has been a matter of astonishment for many. They have displayed a spirit of solidarity which, though not new, seems to have an unprecedented vitality.

We have indicated, only in a general way, what is done. Frenchmen, so divided upon many issues, have endeavoured to make real the third term of the Republican motto: "Liberty, equality, and fraternity." The reading of any directory of the social and charitable works of Catholics¹ the *Agenda protestant*, a list of Hebrew charities, the *Catalogue général officiel* of the Exposition of Paris, 1900,² the "Catalogue of French Exhibits of Social Economy, of Hygiene and Charities" at the St. Louis Exposition, and the annual discourses of the French Academy *sur les prix de la vertu* is a revelation not only of French altruism, but of

¹ See for Paris, Abbé Duplessy, *Paris-religieux*, 1900.

² Vol. XVI.

its growing momentum. The spirit of the teachings of Christianity, of Saint-Simon, of Fourier, and of the later idealists has abundantly entered into this work of social elevation. Some have even exalted this spirit into a religion, the religion of kindness. There is no doubt but that the old school of political economists called *l'école dure*, "the hard school," by Jules Simon, — a school which would do away with all charitable agencies on the ground that they prevent a healthy elimination, has nearly disappeared.¹ On the other hand, the former sentimental giving of alms is less frequent, though still extensively practised. The word "charity," in the sense of beneficence, has been filled with more genuine humanity and more intelligence. More heart controlled by more brain, is the dominant note of this progress in the social and philanthropic movement in France.

¹ Haussonville, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, vol. clii, p. 775.

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND MORALITY

IN all countries moral conditions present grave problems. France is no exception. Divorces have risen from 4,123 in 1885 to 10,800 in 1904, suicides from 5,110 in 1869 to 8,888 in 1904; alcoholism has so increased that the French people, once the most temperate of Europe, now stand in the fore-front of alcohol consumers. The inmates of hospitals for the insane have increased from 37,594 to 71,469.¹ The cases of delinquencies brought before "correctional tribunals" have risen from 184,000 in 1875 to 195,000 in 1904. By putting such figures together — and they are true figures — it is possible to make a most dismal picture; but it is unfortunate that all the evidences of moral progress cannot also be put into mathematical formulæ.

The country has passed through a period of

¹ *Annuaire statistique.*

mental, moral, and religious transformation, during which much that was conventional has been swept away with much that was priceless. Thus, instead of the old scandal of husband and wife living apart, now there is divorce, and in a Catholic country divorce causes a more shocking impression than partially concealed concubinage. Yet in spite of the outcry of the systematic enemies of divorce, the statistics of marriage, as shown by the following tables, are, on the whole, very encouraging:

PROPORTION OF MARRIED AND UNMARRIED MEN						
FROM 18 YEARS TO 59				FROM 60 AND ABOVE		
	BACHELORS	MARRIED	WIDOWERS, LEGALLY SEPARATED OR DIVORCED	BACHELORS	MARRIED	WIDOWERS, LEGALLY SEPARATED OR DIVORCED
In 1872.....	35.51	60.23	4.26	8.37	63.09	28.58
In 1901.....	35.37	60.90	3.75	8.05	64.40	27.55

PROPORTION OF MARRIED AND UNMARRIED WOMEN						
FROM 15 YEARS TO 49				FROM 50 AND ABOVE		
	UNMARRIED	MARRIED	WIDOWS, LEGALLY SEPARATED OR DIVORCED	UNMARRIED	MARRIED	WIDOWS, LEGALLY SEPARATED OR DIVORCED
In 1872.....	38.79	55.49	5.72	10.90	53.81	35.29
In 1901.....	37.12	57.67	5.21	10.83	48.42	40.75

To this should be added the fact that marriages are increasing. From 1886 to 1896 they averaged 281,000 a year. From 1896 to 1906 they were 297,000. In 1907 they attained the high-water mark of 323,000.¹ M. Théry gives the figures of 314,908 marriages, the largest number for the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, except in 1872, the year after the Franco-Prussian war.²

As to the birth-rate, whose low ebb has been frequently referred by the clergy to immorality and irreligion, it must be admitted that this phenomenon is general all over Europe. The argument that this brings France upon a footing of inferiority with Germany has value only for those who make military considerations paramount. The real superiority does not lie in numbers, but in the moral earnestness of individuals. From this point of view it may be honestly asked if the very high birth-rate of 36 per thousand for the French Canadians in the province of Quebec³ suggests higher ethical motives than that of 22 per thousand in France? This birth-rate is still higher than that of several American States, which are far from being the least moral ones of the Union. Frenchmen

¹ *La Revue*, May 29, 1909, p. 564.

² *Les progrès économiques de la France*, p. 332.

³ Siegfried, A., *Le Canada*, p. 290.

large are much perplexed over this question, which has been discussed in every great French periodical.¹ To grapple with it there was organised the *Alliance nationale pour l'accroissement de la population française*. Were this society merely to collect reliable data upon the many sides of the problem, it would doubtless render great services.

The increase of alcoholism is largely explained by the fact that France earns much of her daily bread through the culture of the vine — in some parts of the country it is the only possible culture. Again, the Republicans, in their great extension of freedom, made no exception for the sale of alcohol, and consequently from 1881 to 1903 there were opened 110,000 new saloons.² So long as *cabarets* are so numerous the consumption of alcohol will remain extensive. According to the last report of the Minister of Justice there is an intimate correlation between crime and alcoholism. The classes making the most extensive use of drinks — fishermen, miners, truckmen, and factory hands — have the largest number of criminals.³ The good sense, the intelligence, and the conscience of the country is

¹ See a series of articles upon "French Depopulation" in *La Revue Hebdomadaire* for 1909. Those by M. Charles Gide, and by the Dean of the Law School of Paris, M. Ch. Lyon-Caen, are masterly.

² *L'Illustration*, Dec. 17, 1904.

³ *Le Temps*, Oct. 15, 1909.

arraying itself against intemperance. There is now an anti-alcoholic group in the Parliament, led by that distinguished and courageous deputy, M. Joseph Reinach. The Minister of War has taken a decided stand upon the question. The officers of the army are ordered to give lectures to their soldiers upon this evil. The teachers do the same work in their schools. Nearly two thousand anti-alcoholic societies are waging war upon distilled — not upon fermented — drinks, many organisations are even taking more radical positions. Temperance restaurants are opened. The Academy of Sciences gives its moral support to this cause. The attitude of the Parliament is such that one may expect two important reforms: one the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of absinthe, and the other, the reduction of the number of saloons. The promoters of this movement are physicians, scientists, philanthropists of large culture who, like M. Reinach, would say, "We know that the struggle against alcoholism is for our country, for our race, a question of life and death, of physical and intellectual health or of hopeless decadence." Never was a temperance crusade carried on more judiciously.

The very intensity of modern civilisation has almost everywhere brought about an increase of

mental diseases. However, one must not exaggerate this. The figures which we have given are not absolute indices of increase. Patients are now known and treated who formerly were almost unnoticed. If they were harmless and poor they were allowed to go about, and when rich, they were kept at home, often in absolute seclusion; now they are almost always sent to institutions. The mildest cases of those who are dependent upon the State have been scattered in families of rural districts with good results. Most of the hospitals for these patients have put into practice our greater knowledge of mental pathology and the idea of a greater kindness in dealing with these unfortunates. Suicides, bad in themselves, bad for society, bad every way, are not absolutely signs of moral retrogression. With the paroxysms of activity, of competition, of well-being, of pleasures and their concomitants, these deeds of despair were to be expected.

As to crime, if the cases referred to "correctional tribunals" have risen from 184,000 in 1875 to 195,000 in 1904, it is a fact that convictions for murder fell from 3,840 to 2,050. The prisoners in the "houses of arrest," from 1871 to 1905, decreased from 14,838 to 5,940; the convicts of departmental prisons diminished from 22,018 to 15,404, and the inmates of re-

form-schools from 7,310 to 3,039. The overstated charges of the conservatives, that much crime is left unpunished, contains much truth. It is a fact that, in the humanisation of justice, juries and judges have been lenient with transgressors, not from indifference, corruption, or cowardice, but from a more philosophical and abstract conception of justice, or from the idea that delinquencies have in them a social element, for which the individual should not be punished. The humanistic movement has led Republicans to apply too suddenly the ethics of the parable of the Prodigal Son to culprits. Formerly delinquents of almost every kind, called for military service, were incorporated into African companies; but the Parliament, thinking that the transgressions committed did not deserve such hard treatment, and hoping that the good element of the army would exert a bettering influence, placed these *repris de justice* in the regular army. The result of this was an alarming increase of crime among soldiers. The principle of moral contagiousness, which applies to right as well as to wrong, is a sound one; but in this case the reform was not sufficiently gradual or hedged with sufficient legal guarantees. The outcome was not calmly studied, but the opposition used it for partisan ends. As to crime in

general, were the nation to spend, for a larger police force, a few of the many millions devoted to the army and navy, it is certain that there would be a striking improvement.

A fair survey of French criminality shows that some forms of delinquencies have altogether disappeared, while the distressing feature of the present is the increase of juvenile crime. This, however, is no more exceptional in France than in Holland, Italy, and Germany.¹ England is favoured in this respect, because its benevolent societies have exported to the colonies orphans largely recruited from classes likely to yield many young delinquents. Catholics ascribe this juvenile moral lapse in France to the absence of religious instruction in the schools. Unfortunately for their claims, it is well known that the greatest periods of increase were at a time when the Catholic catechism was everywhere taught in the schools, and these schools were under the control of the Church. During the period from 1841-1851 the delinquencies rose from 14,781 to 22,251, that is, 33 per cent; from 1851 to 1861 the rise was from 22,251 to 25,733, or 15 per cent; while from 1881 to 1891, under unsectarian schools, there was an increase from 35,332 to 36,975, or a little less than 5 per

¹ Fouillée, A., *La France au point de vue moral*, p. 158.

cent.¹ *Le Temps* says, on the authority of Gabriel Tarde, that from 1830 to 1880, under the system of national Catholic schools and the absolute ascendancy of the clergy, juvenile delinquency had quadrupled in France, at least for boys.² Fair-minded men, like Fouillée and Tarde, have shown that the schools were not responsible for juvenile crime. Among the most potent causes pointed out are the phenomenal development of saloons, of the yellow press, of pornographic literature. In many cases of juvenile delinquents it was found that, for the most part, they had managed to avoid schools of any kind, and that the crimes are performed between sixteen and twenty-one when the average boy has been for some time out of school. In dealing with criminals, the Republic has been actuated less by social vengeance than by the purpose to save the culprit, less by the penitentiary idea than by the reformatory. Prisoners are subjected to a régime which will help them to earn their daily bread more easily when they leave prison, while the uneducated, under 35 years of age, are compelled to attend prison schools.

The most encouraging feature in the present situation is that the growth of every evil has

¹ Fouillée, A., *La France au point de vue moral*, p. 158.

² March 20, 1897.

called forth moral agencies to oppose it, while new institutions and new moral conceptions were imparting strength to the national life. It may astonish many to learn that for several years Paris had a Superior School of Morals in which the leading spirits of France discussed all possible questions of practical ethics. That institution has since evolved into a more comprehensive one, the School of High Social Studies, in which the foremost scholars and the foremost men of action throw all the light they can upon the great scientific, moral, and social issues of our time. More competence and good-will have never united in a more generous service. "The Union of Free Thinkers and Free Believers," another organisation of ethical culture, discussed, on Sundays during 1908-1909, "Social Problems and Personal Duties," rallying many earnest men of large calibre.

There are between fifty and sixty societies banded together under the name of "Federation of Societies against Pornography" to oppose public licence. They all, often with great courage, fight the sale or exhibition of obscene engravings, obscene books, obscene and grossly immoral plays, and kindred evils. Through these organisations, from 1891 to 1905, 915 cases of infamous immoral trade were referred to the

courts, 1,846 individuals were accused, 761 were condemned to less than a year of imprisonment, and 16 to more.¹

The *Société des droits de l'homme* is ready anywhere to take the defence of those whose rights are disregarded. It takes up every year seven or eight thousand cases before the French tribunals.² It may be added here that the habit of litigation about trifles has lost much of its hold upon French peasants. The former attitude of Frenchmen toward animals has undergone a change. There has long been the efficient *Société protectrice des animaux*, and recently was founded *La Ligue française pour la protection du cheval*. The movement of greater kindness toward animals, strong and healthy as it is, has gone to the extreme of having, at Reuil, near Paris, a *Maison de santé pour les animaux*.³

Besides all the agencies which make for morality there are those of the churches, which are quite potent. Religion is the greatest ally of morality. And after all, is not this the point where the Christian and the Free Thinker may come to an understanding? What one aims at

¹ Bérenger, R., *Manuel pratique pour la lutte contre la pornographie*, p. 152. This little volume is an admirable study of the stricter laws of moral repression enacted by the Republic, the methods to be used by societies of moral reform, and the notable cases brought before the courts.

² *Le Signal*, Nov. 23, 1907.

³ *Le Siècle*, Oct. 26, 1909.

in the name of God, the other demands in the name of reason. The great moral principles in which Christian and rationalistic ethics concur the Parliament requires to be taught in all the primary schools of the country.¹ That teaching not only clarifies moral consciousness, but also acts powerfully upon the pupils by moral suggestions which cannot but be efficient.

The censors of the Republic cannot deny the fact that, judged by their legislation, their organised efforts, and their education, Frenchmen have never displayed a deeper sense of responsibility and of moral solidarity. Never have ethical problems been more prominent in the mind of the thinking *élite*. Never have moral considerations so determined French philosophical thought, and never were there so many books written on morals or on the moral aspects of education, of politics, philosophy, and sociology. The attitude of the best artists is no longer what it was under the Empire. The doctrine of art for art's sake has lost its former prominence, and some artists have substituted that of "art from life for life." The doctrine of the moral utility of art has never been preached to such an extent. Again, while literary men, like artists, are often unmoral and many immoral, there is

¹ See the chapter upon Moral Instruction.

now a moral purpose in much of contemporary literature which was absolutely wanting in by-gone days. This is specially true of the drama and of fiction. The leading writers themselves are better men than those of half a century ago.

The national idea is now less chauvinistic than ever before. To love one's country is no longer to hate that of another. At the time of the Tonkin expedition the motto of the Radicals in Parliament was, "Tonkin for the Tonkinese!" There is now a large body of Frenchmen who, in reference to the complications in North Africa, say, "Morocco for the Moroccans!" In no country of the world is there a greater readiness than in France to accept the international golden rule; and even in the matter of Franco-German relations, since M. Jules Cambon became French ambassador in Berlin there has been progress. The thought of war is more and more revolting to Frenchmen. Justice and equity loom larger in the popular mind than force. When, in 1907, the *Petit Parisien* had a plebiscite which called forth 15,000,000 votes upon the greatest Frenchman, the highest place was not given to a warrior, but to a scientist who ever preached peace — Pasteur. The second was awarded to Victor Hugo — the poet

who in his best days exalted peace — and Napoleon only came fourth. Another paper, by the same process, asked who are the great men, not yet in the Panthéon, who should be there. The men designated were Pasteur, Gambetta, Thiers, Parmentier, Curie, Denfert-Rochereau, Savorgnan de Brazza, Alexandre Dumas, and Lamartine. The only soldier in this list, Denfert-Rochereau, the heroic defender of Belfort, came sixth.

This is in perfect keeping with the standards of moral value at the present time. It may be fearlessly asserted that the fundamental conceptions of the basis of life have been renovated. The idea of evolution and progress has replaced the old dogma of unchangeableness and of dead stability, which ignored the necessity for individuals and societies constantly to readjust themselves to ever-changing conditions. The asceticism of former days is passing away. The body is no longer the organ that must be weakened in order to strengthen the soul, the proud human reason is no longer to be humbled before a great ecclesiastical authority; but body and mind must be developed for social service.

The new conception of the body has led to great progress in sanitation, in hygiene and physical culture, while belief in the soundness

of the light of reason has generated the movement of education and of scientific research, which we have sketched. Labour, formerly viewed as Millet has represented it, a divine penance for man on account of sin, now seems more and more a factor of happiness. Nature no longer appears as a hard, harsh stepmother giving man a painfully earned morsel of bread; she is no longer, in French eyes, the divine scourge of a revengeful God, but the generous rewarder of intelligent and conscientious efforts. Matter, once associated in French public opinion with that which is gross, impure, and perishable, has come to be viewed as a mode of explaining the universe quite as mysterious as the spirit itself. In recasting their own thought in reference to man's place in human society, or in the cosmos, Frenchmen have largely freed themselves from systems built upon materialistic doctrines. There is a noticeable tendency to rise above the ethnic fatalism of polygenists, like Gobineau, or mechanistic determinists like Taine.

There is also a visible inclination to discard the system of brutal ethics, built upon the doctrine of evolution as formulated by its illustrious founder, Charles Darwin. The ethical doctrine resting upon the principle of the struggle for the

“survival of the fittest” has always been obnoxious to the Gallic admirers of the author of “The Origin of Species.” They accepted his biological conclusions, but not the ethical inferences of his disciples. The principle of “cooperation” has gained ground over that of “struggle for existence.” Renouvier claims that “man, rising above sheer biological evolution, has brought into human society the law of justice, of charity and solidarity.” M. Léon Bourgeois has changed the formula of Darwin by saying that life “is the struggles of each for the existence of all.” Fouillée has made it “a struggle for coexistence,” and Deschanel makes it “the union for life.” Clemenceau, with an earnestness that no one can question, says, “Socialism is social goodness in action; it is the intervention of all for the sake of the victim of the fatal vitality of others. . . . Man hinders man, I have said. Man also helps man. The help for life in the struggle for life, that is, the order of life, born of the supreme law of solidarity of all.”¹

Taken all in all, the trend of French ethics is not far from that of the Founder of Christianity. In the general life the word *duty* has come to take a larger place and to be more inclusive.

¹ *La Mêlée sociale*, pp. XIV and XV.

Duty toward others has come to have the sense of duty toward ourselves. Morality is man's highest adaptation to the needs of all. The sense of moral obligation springs from moral convictions rather than from religious beliefs. The supremacy of conscience is more and more asserted. When members of juries in the department of Yonne refuse to swear in the name of God,¹ if they are sincere, their act is ethically superior to the blind or mechanical conformity of former days. Intellectual honesty has never been more honoured, nor casuistry more unpopular. Love of truth, not of pure knowledge, but of that apprehension of reality which tells upon our deepest life, is growing. Though appearances might lead some to infer the contrary, French traditional virtues, such as family love, social cheerfulness, the prevalence of thrift, of economy, and the hatred of debts have never been more flourishing. As Comte d'Avenel says, "a thrifty people will never be a gambling people."² In the French army an officer is suspended for debts. Former conventional habits without any ethical motives have been greatly disturbed either by moral revolts or by new views of man's biological, economic, and social relations; but

¹ *Le Temps*, Aug. 7, 1909.

² *Les Français de mon temps*, p. 74.

France has never had a keener sense of moral rectitude, of solidarity and, with all the failings that her critics magnify, she leans strongly to the side of genuine moral life.

CHAPTER IX

RELIGIOUS DOUBT AND RELIGION

TO form a just estimate of the real religious situation, we must not assume that everything which is unsatisfactory now was ideal at the end of the Second Empire. The *Athéisme et le péril social*¹ of Bishop Dupanloup paints a dismal picture of the religious situation at that time. The sermons of Protestant preachers present no brighter outlook.² That of Père Didon, in 1867, is no more hopeful than that which a Dominican would draw now.³ A former member of the same order, writing upon the Commune at its very close, said, "What, then, is a people without a God? Philosophers had endeavoured to say, but facts have revealed it with a reality that defies words. The demonstration of social atheism is finished. Providence gave it for an hour the grandest of thea-

¹ 1866.

² See Edmond de Pressensé, *Discours religieux*; Eugène Bersier, *Sermons*, vol. I, II, and III.

³ Raynaud (Père Stanislas), *Le Père Didon*, p. 52.

tres, the freest of orgies and the most terrible of dramas. . . . There is the work of a people that has no longer any God.”¹ Voicing the bankruptcy of faith at the same period, Père Didon says, “We have been defeated, we were to be. We know neither how to command nor how to obey. We have lost the faith. A people without faith is doomed to defeat.”² In 1872 he speaks of irreligion as national.³

At the Protestant National Synod in the same year Guizot speaks of “a new explosion of anti-Christian ardour.”⁴ At the same session Pasteur Athanase Coquerel shows “atheism asserting itself with an energy of negation without precedent,” “the atheism of the street,” “atheism penetrating into all ranks of society,” “atheism in persons of all ages.”⁵ Another delegate states that the scientific trend has become little by little “positivistic and materialistic.”⁶ A little later, Père Didon glorifies “heaven which seems empty to the eyes of our sceptical generation.”⁷ In his sermons in Marseilles, the antagonism of irreligion is the leitmotif of his

¹ Loyson, H., *De la réforme catholique*, p. 105.

² Didon (Père J. H.), *Lettres du Père Didon à un ami*, 1902, p. 2.

³ Raynaud, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

⁴ Bersier E., *Histoire du Synode général de l'Eglise réformée*, 1872, vol. I, p. 290.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

⁷ Didon, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

preaching.¹ "In our land of France," he says, "we are born Christians, we die Christians, but between the cradle and the grave passions speak like mistresses, scepticism invades our minds, material life with its vortices of business absorb our time, and we do not live like Christians. Faith is only at the two extremities of our life: the cradle which belongs to her, the grave which belongs to her also, and that is all."²

When the faith of the "cradle" and the "faith of the grave" is all, one may say that the vital faith of the nation is gone; but that we will not say either of the early days of the Republic or of the present. The actual religious losses were not so great as represented then nor as lamented now. A fair correction of the religious parallax will place us face to face with a more hopeful state of things. The loss which many Catholics deplore is their former ability to impose their belief. Professor Fonsegrieve says with regret that two victories have been won by society over "the doctrine of Catholic truth—the coexistence of several religions in countries

¹ Raynaud, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

² *Ibid.*, p. 125. Abbé Gayraud, a former Dominican, now priest and deputy, thirty years later speaks in a similar manner, "The mass of electors have scarcely anything more from Catholicism than baptism, first communion, the forms of marriage and some of the practices of Church attendance dictated by habits and social conventions." *La République et la paix religieuse*, p. 43.

equally civilised, and the proclamation of independence of philosophical thought.”¹ There has been unquestionably a great nominal decline in formal membership. Abbé Cresty, in 1905, set at about eleven millions those in France who could properly be called Catholics.² This does not necessarily mean a real decrease of spiritual power, but that the Church has been relieved of a dead weight that was its bane. Its grave error was to consider these accretions as sterling religious values, and to speak of “Catholic France” in terms which were as gratifying to this body as they were misleading to all.

The stern fact was that the nation was moving away from its religious moorings. Now the priest has been deprived of his former non-religious power—the power which rendered him so unpopular under Napoleon and under Mac-Mahon. He has ceased to be the man through whom almost every one had to secure state-advancement in any career, or impunity from crime at the hand of the judge. No more is he the stepping-stone of the religious politician to office. He has no longer any Tartufe about him. No more can he molest the non-Catholic scholar or terrorise the luke-warm Catholic pro-

¹ Péchenard, Mgr. P. L., *Les Luittes de l'Eglise*, p. 775.

² *L'Esprit nouveau dans l'action morale et religieuse*, p. 36.

fessor, or even the doubting one, by the prospect of dismissal. Even his pulpit is no longer a source of effectual religious threats. He must convince, not command, his hearers. His parishioners expect from him more education and more culture—and he has it. Free-thinking opposition has called forth the latent intellectual energy of the priest, and anti-Clericalism has really strengthened him in the conflict.

However, the repeated political defeats of Clerical candidates show that the clergy have lost their former hold, and that the causes which they endorse are decidedly unpopular. As Comte G. d'Avenel, a distinguished French Catholic, puts it, Catholicism "has lost its material domination, the secular arm. It no longer leads the State and has no longer any place in the State. It has lost the masses; its temples, in a thousand places, are deserted."¹ Anti-Clericalism is often synonymous with anti-religion. Socialism, long and bitterly antagonised by the priests, has become a unit against them. Science, attacked by the clergy, and remembering the treatment of its most distinguished spirits in former days, often counts every scientific advance as so much gained upon the spirit of obscurantism in the Church. Many

¹ *Les Français de mon temps*, p. 165.

Frenchmen have rejected conceptions of God unworthy of our age. The "vengeful God," the God defender of mechanical morality, the "God *gendarme* on behalf of capitalists," are conceptions which retain their grasp upon the masses but are abandoned by thinkers. There are those—and they are not new—who hold sincerely that atheistical science unravels much better than anything else the enigma of the universe. Blatant, arrogant, and militant atheists exist, but they are not as common as might be supposed.¹

The churchless are far from indifferent to religious problems, and any able religious speaker will find hearers outside of the churches more easily than in America. In the early part of 1907 the *Mercure de France* organised a vast inquiry, asking eminent men "whether we are witnessing a dissolution or an evolution of religious thought?" The overwhelming majority of French contributors decided for the second alternative, that we are in the presence of a religious evolution.² The editor of that interesting symposium wisely says, "It is undeniable that religious studies have taken, of late years, an

¹ Sabatier, P., *Lettre ouverte à S. E. le Cardinal Gibbons*, 1907, p. 16.

² *Mercure de France*, 1907, Nos. 236, 237, 238, 239, 240 and 241.

extraordinary development; never perhaps, since the Reformation has there been such a display of curiosity for all that concerns religion, such labours of erudition, of criticism and of propaganda. There is in all countries the publication of works of the highest order upon religious questions; there is the creation or extension of Reviews devoted to religious philosophy, to the history of religions, to controversies; there is the ever-increasing number of lectures and regular courses in which the religious idea is studied in all its manifestations. We must also recall the work done in France at the *Musée Guimet*, at the Practical School of High Studies, at the *Collège de France*, at the School of Anthropology, at the College of Social Sciences, at the School of High Social Studies, in denominational schools, and particularly the recent creation, at the Sorbonne, of several chairs of religious history etc.”¹

The *Musée Guimet* gives to those interested in the study of comparative religions materials nowhere else available in the world. The *Collège de France* has had for many years an admirable course of highly important scientific studies on religions. Professor Réville, long the incumbent of this chair, was a radical Unitarian,

¹ *Ibid.*, 236, p. 577.

but a most candid and able scholar, ever insisting upon the transcendent importance of religion. Professor Loisy, recently elected to the same chair, is animated with a kindred spirit. The Practical School of High Studies in the Sorbonne has a score of courses by specialists devoted to the religions of the great peoples of the world, while the Sorbonne itself has now three chairs studying different periods in the history of Christianity.

The feeling grows that religion has been one of the most fundamental determinants of the character of various civilisations. At the School of High Social Studies, where all the great questions of our time have been ably and honestly discussed, religion has also its place. The published lectures for 1903-1904 reveal a deep concern for belief on the part of all lecturers, and a profound sense of the social utility of religion.¹ The size of the audiences, along with their character, is also quite significant. There was never, during the preceding régime, such an intellectual zest for the problems of religion. The philosophers have given—and are still giving—a large place to this subject. They admit more and more the importance of religious feelings in the evolution of society and in com-

¹ *Religions et sociétés*, 1905.

parative psychology, as well as the bearing of those feelings upon the various aspects of Metaphysics. The majority of them are ready to concede the practical value of the idea of God in ethics, as well as the great action of religious forces upon sociological phenomena. In the philosophical teaching of the secondary schools there is a general insistence upon the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. The theological conceptions of the professors vary most widely, from the God of the theologians of Latin Christianity to that of the pantheists. They are no longer left to the necessity of accepting or rejecting a single definite conception of God as if it were the only one possible, but have other theistic alternatives. "Atheism," says M. Georges Lyon, "is exceptional in the French philosophical world."¹ This opinion of the distinguished rector of the Academy of Lille, has been again and again endorsed before the writer by other prominent speculative thinkers.

The introduction of philosophy into the domain of religion upon a new scale is visible in the works of the best Catholic and Protestant writers, in the theses of Protestant students and in the better class of sermons. While the cleavage which has taken place in the world

¹ *Enseignement et religion*, 1907, p. 81.

of beliefs has arrayed, on the one side, many who have become unreligious and atheistic, a corresponding movement has taken place, on the other, toward a more positive faith. Atheists have become deists, deists have accepted a broad theism, the philosophical theists became for a time neo-Christians, the neo-Christians liberal Catholics, and some liberal Catholics have become ultramontane. Among those who have gravitated toward belief there has been a tendency to give, at every angle of the religious prism, a larger place to the mystical spirit without surrendering their philosophical ideals.

It is in part this tendency that has led toward the Catholic Church, men like Brunetière, de Vogüé, Bourget, Coppée, Huysmans, and others who were Free-thinkers.¹ There is philosophical toleration in the Church sufficient to keep in it such distinguished scholars as Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, Georges Picot, Thureau-Dangin, Georges Guyau; scientists like Gaudry and Lapparent; philosophers like Boutroux and Ollé-Laprune; critics like Brunetière, Doumic, and lesser lights, who are not inclined to move backward. Whatever be the strenuous restrictions imposed from Rome, there is a large

¹ Sargeret, J., *Les grands convertis*; Abbé Delfour, *Les Contemporains*, 1895.

body of religious literature breathing a new spirit of rational certainty, of strong philosophical grasp of the basic truths of theology. Even a mere perusal of such works as the following will convince one that reason and science have never been more honoured by the Catholic thinkers of France: Abbé de Brogliè, *Le conditions modernes de l' accord entre la foi et la raison*;¹ Fonsegrieve, *Le Catholicisme et la religion de l'esprit*;² Abbé Laberthonnière, *Essais de philosophie religieuse*;³ Abbé Klein, *Le Fait religieux et la manière de l'observer*;⁴ Abbé Denis, *Esquisse d'une apologie philosophique du Christianisme*;⁵ Le P. La Barre, *La Vie du dogma catholique*;⁶ Le P. G. de Pascal, *Le christianisme*.⁷ Catholic writers have able works also on the religious life of England and America, which will generate in the Church disappointing hopes⁸ about the progress of Catholicism in those countries; but these books, none the less, represent philosophical and historical progress.

The same conclusions must be reached in reference to their Reviews. They have, for example, *Le Correspondant*, the *Annales de philosophie*

¹ 1903.² 1899.³ 1903.⁴ 1903.⁵ 1898.⁶ 1898.⁷ 1903.

⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *Le Catholicisme en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle. La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle*; Henri Brémont, *L'Inquiétude religieuse*, 1^{ère} série, 1902 and 2^{ème} série, 1909. See also books and review articles by Abbé Klein.

chrétienne, the *Revue des questions historiques*, the *Nouvelle revue théologique*, the *Etudes*, *La Réforme sociale*, the *Revue biblique*, *Le Sillon*, *La démocratie chrétienne*, the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse*, the *Revue de l'institut catholique de Paris*, etc., which are equally worthy with the publications of any other religious body of the world. They have largely developed, also, a popular press which we may call "yellow," a press which will do much harm to the Church by its extravagance and fanaticism, but the character of those above referred to deserves much praise. The publications founded long ago have come to a greater importance under the Republic, while the others suggest enormous progress. They have even won over *La Revue des Deux Mondes*.

At the same time, the spiritual autocracy of the Vatican is as absolute as ever; the Gallican liberties, episcopal dignity and the independence of theological research are things of the past. Some bishops — not those appointed since the Separation — have endeavoured to modernise the education of their clergy and have advocated the study of science as a help to faith. In some ways the Catholic universities of Paris and of Lille have done nobly in introducing into their work modern critical and scientific meth-

ods, but with only a very moderate success. Those who are leaning toward obscurantism are far more numerous. In the seminary of Issy — not in a distant part of France, but in Paris — a theological student asked how Noah could have fed all the animals in the ark, having so little room for provisions. The professor answered, "One may consider as probable that all animals in the ark suffered from sea-sickness and therefore had no need of food." ¹

But whatever be the system of training, Catholic clergymen show a greater readiness to break away from the Church, and several hundred priests have left it during the last third of a century. Through the increase of intellectual honesty, the influence of the military service and the loss of political power by the clergy, there has been a wholesome elimination of the former doubtful and mercenary elements of the priesthood. Never was there a more active and aggressive spirit among young priests and never have the French clergy allied to a greater degree culture with devotion, and life with doctrine. If the growth of the orders is, as the Ultramontanes assert, an index of spiritual progress, then there has never been a greater advance than during recent years. In any

¹ J. de Narfon, *op. cit.*, p. 357.

case one may say of the clergy, both secular and regular, that they have grown in intensity and earnestness where they are dominant, in intelligence and moral power where they have been in touch with the philosophical and scientific life. Politically and socially they move in a narrower range; they no longer reflect State prestige, but their real lasting spiritual influence is greater. When they do not waste their energy in condemning, for the thousandth time, the wickedness of anti-clericals, their spirit is that of a large evangelism, permeated with earnestness and poetry. Some of them lay stress upon natural virtues as preferable to supernatural and passive ones, though they believe in both. As in the past, they insist upon the immutability of their Church; but, strange as it may seem, now they speak also of her progress and of her wonderful adaptability to changed conditions. Apart from their innumerable efforts in France, they are leading in Catholic missions. M. Eugène Louvet states that they have in the mission field 8,500 French priests, 33,600 French nuns, and about 3,600 French friars.¹

There has also been a great change in the laity. Hitherto the bishops used this element

¹ Quoted by Abbé Gayraud, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

for agitation — they still do — but it has become more active in the Church. Laymen are no longer the indifferent, passive, voiceless people of four decades ago, whose religion was absolutely formal. Several laymen of eminence have written books which Catholic leaders should heed, such as that of Julien de Narfon's *Vers l'Eglise libre*; that of L. Chaigne, *Les Catholiques français et leurs difficultés actuelles*; Dr. Marcel Rifaux, *Les Conditions de retour au catholicisme*; or that of Comte G. d'Avenel, *Le Français de mon temps*. The country never had more Catholics of an earnest, genuine faith, willing to stand as faithful witnesses to their principles, than now. The life of the Republic has developed among them affinities for religious organisation, which were formerly wanting, and which are still lacking in such Catholic lands as Spain and Austria. They never can again lay their hands upon the great forces of philosophical, scientific, social, political, and industrial life, now out of their reach. But while that is the case, if they wish to do religious work they have never been in a more promising condition.

Protestants also have suffered certain numerical losses, but much of the elimination which has taken place has been beneficial. The cold,

lifeless orthodoxy of the Empire, and its colourless rationalism have disappeared. As the writer shows elsewhere, Protestants have never been so active nor so influential.

Judaism is also an important factor of religious culture. It shows signs, not a few, of a clearer religious consciousness, of a more intelligent allegiance to its faith, and of broad charities. Hebrews have been foremost as generous givers for objects of general interest.

CHAPTER X

THE CONTEMPORARY FRENCHMAN IN THE NEW LIFE

THE consequences of the progress which we have sketched manifest themselves in many ways. The material environments of the contemporary Frenchman have been strikingly improved. The writer has known a village for fifty years during which the population has remained stationary, but the homes are much larger and nearly twice as numerous. From 1871 to 1907, there were built in France 1,300,000 more homes than were torn down. The huts with only one window are growing fewer, while the new erections have generally more than five windows.¹ The mud houses with thatched roofs are now viewed by the people as the relics of by-gone days. The peasant who under the Empire spent his evenings in the dark, or made a most moderate use of tallow candles, is now provided with abundant petro-

¹ *Annuaire statistique.*

leum, the consumption of which has passed from 0 *k.* 861 to 11 *k.* 200 per inhabitant.¹ The introduction and wide distribution of petroleum among the masses has created a revolution in their habits. Paris, as well as other large centres, used sparingly wax candles and vegetal oil lamps, with a little gas; now the city has the most modern means of lighting with artistic fixtures, the beauty of which remains unsurpassed anywhere. The use of coal for all purposes has increased from 500 to 1,355 kilogrammes per inhabitant.

The adulteration of food is more clever and more frequent than before, though it is severely punished when detected; it may be doubted, however, if this fraud in the quality of food—when it exists—is more detrimental to health than the deterioration which formerly came from ignorance and lack of adequate means to preserve it. As a whole, food is far more abundant and much better than under the Empire. Even in the most backward villages the range of comestibles has been greatly widened. In rural districts, not to speak of cities, grocers have trebled and quadrupled the articles of food which they keep. Butchers are unanimous in maintaining that the inferior cuts of meat have not increased

¹ Instead of paying 0 *f.* 28 per kilogramme he pays only 0 *f.* 11.

in price, but because so many people now desire the better pieces the price of these has gone up. There has been a large increase in the use of almost all articles of food. The consumption of wheat has passed from 2 hectolitres 30 per inhabitant to 3 *h.* 02; potatoes from 223 kilogrammes to 359; sugar from 7 *l.* 8 to 14 *l.* 8; cacao from 221 grammes to 596; tea from 7 grammes to 29; beer from 21 litres to 37; distilled alcohol from 2 *l.* 81 to 3 *l.* 56, and wine from 154 litres to 166.¹ During the last fifteen years the use of the following articles of food, per inhabitant, in Paris, has ascended 48.2 per cent for fish, 4.7 for meats, 3.3 for butter, 20.7 for cheese, 35.5 for eggs, 135 for cider, 27.9 for wines.²

On all sides are evidences that Frenchmen at large are better fed and for less money. Wheat decreased from 35 *f.* 50 a quintal in 1871 to 17 *f.* 35 in 1906, rye from 23 *f.* 50 to 15 *f.* 50, maize from 24.00 to 15.50, barley from 19.00 to 15.25, oats from 21.00 to 16.50. Flour passed from 0 *f.* 52 per kilogramme to 0 *f.* 17, potatoes from 0 *f.* 06 to 0 *f.* 11, rice from 0 *f.* 45 to 0 *f.* 24, butter from 3 *f.* 20 to 3 *f.* 10, sugar from 0 *f.* 85 to 0 *f.* 32, coffee from 1 *f.* 60 to 1 *f.* 04, cacao from 1 *f.* 60 to 1 *f.* 73, cheese from 1 *f.* 60 to

¹ *Ibid.*

² Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

1 f. 20, salted meat from 1 f. 20 to 1 f. 70, beef from 0 f. 70 to 0 f. 65, mutton from 0 f. 80 to 0 f. 75.¹ At the same time wages have risen. In 1872 farm hands received 2 f. 04 and other labourers 3 f. 09 per day; in 1900 the average pay for non-trained workmen outside of Paris was about 4 f. 20.² The wages of artisans and trained workmen have risen from 1870 to 1900 in a proportion represented by 0.76 and 1.04, while the cost of food and lodging of the same persons has dropped from 1.05 to 1.00, and the buying power of wages, though these men work fewer hours, has increased from 0.72 in 1872 to 1.00 in 1900.³

A great change has also taken place in the matter of external well being. In the use of clothing, it may be regretted that the dress of the people, especially in the provinces, has lost something of its quaintness and picturesqueness; but this has been amply compensated by a better and larger provision of wearing apparel. The use of cotton per capita has increased from 2 k. 7 to 5 k. 2; wool from 5 k. 2 to 5 k. 8; silk has remained stationary. During the last fifteen years there has been an increase of 113,200,000 kilogrammes of textile raw material,

¹ *Annuaire statistique.*

² *Catalogue officiel de l'Exposition universelle de Paris*, vol. XVI.

³ *Annuaire statistique.*

194 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

devoted either to clothe the people or to make fine fabrics for exportation.¹ What has greatly contributed to a better national clothing is the lower price of raw textile material. From 1871 to 1907, wool has fallen from 2 f. 80 to 2.37 per kilogramme, cotton from 1 f. 96 to 1 f. 63, stripped hemp from 1 f. 03 to 0 f. 79, stripped flax from 1 f. 55 to 0 f. 94, and silk from 70 f. 00 to 48 f. 50.² Where the children of the masses were shoeless under the Empire, now a large number of them have shoes, and wooden shoes are more and more discarded. Where watches were carried only by the well-to-do, now not only operatives, but even peasants have them. Bicycles have become very common. Motor cycles and tricycles have also been popularised. Automobiles have been multiplied so that even people of moderate means own them. Steam power has so increased that while, in 1875, each inhabitant had only 0.067 horse-power, in 1906 he had 0.273.³

The Frenchman travels much more. While thirty-two years ago he averaged only 3.7 rides a year on the railroads, he now indulges in 6.7. Where he rode 131 kilometres, now he covers 216. Though railroad fares have been lowered

¹ Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

² *Annuaire statistique.*

³ Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

he spends now 9 f. 40 a year instead of 6 f. 80. The railroads now transport 3,546 kilogrammes of merchandise for him instead of 1,673 kilogrammes.¹ Travel for pleasure and for education has been greatly promoted by the greater comfort of the cars, by the rapidity of the trains, and by a fine literature which interests the Frenchman in the beauty and the historic associations of his own land. Over two hundred and fifty *syndicats d'initiative* in the provinces² make great efforts to encourage travel in the parts of the country where they are. The *Club alpin français* has called attention to the beauty of the mountainous districts and given a strong impetus to mountain-climbing and sight-seeing. The Automobile Club has done a kindred work for the country at large. The Touring Club has inspired and facilitated travel, securing lower rates for its members, waging war upon poor hotels, and pointing out good ones, urging the authorities to improve roads, helping the State to build new ones, re-wooding denuded hills, and in many ways furthering the cause of intelligent, educational, and profitable touring. M. Millerand, Minister of Public Works, has just founded in his department of the executive, the *Office du tourisme*, thereby bring-

¹ Théry, *ibid.*, p. 222.

² *Le Siècle*, Oct. 28, 1909.

196 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

ing the State to co-operate with all agencies to further travel at home.

As a result of this movement, the Frenchman has come to discover his own country and to be struck, not only with the attractiveness of France, which has so thoroughly welded peoples of different affinities, but by the infinite charm of the social condition thereby created, the monuments which recall these great changes, and the beautiful scenery which often crowns the whole. He wishes to protect all this from the vandalism of commerce or from the blind utilitarianism of some industries. To that end was founded the *Société pour la protection des paysages de France*. This association has succeeded in having the Parliament establish a committee of artistic landscapes in every department in order to preserve them. Furthermore, the society makes a systematic opposition to engineers who deface fine views and to vulgar advertisers who in every country spoil much of our pleasure.

The Frenchman has broken through the barriers of a narrow nationalism. The tendencies of his mind have always been in the direction of an abstract universalism, but of late years he has manifested the most genuine interest in what other people do. Hence he has been open to foreign influences. Russia, Scandinavia, Ger-

many, Great Britain, and the United States have touched his life most profoundly and in a multitude of directions. While this is true of high culture and of commerce, it is so to a remarkable extent with learned societies and other organizations which, whatever be their specific aims, create international good will and amity. There are the *Alliance franco-britannique*, the *Société franco-écossaise*, the *Société d'études italiennes*, the *Ligue franco-italienne*, the *Société espagnole d'excursions*, the *Société sinigo-japonaise*, and the *Comité France-Amérique*, and many others. There is quite a number of really international societies, such as the *Société d'études et de correspondance internationale*, the *Société d'échange international des enfants et des jeunes gens*, the *Société internationale des études de questions d'assistance*, the *Alliance universitaire internationale*, not to mention many others which constitute numerous personal and social ties between the Frenchman and representatives of other nationalities. Home travel has led to more foreign travel. The Frenchman now visits other countries; he becomes now and then an explorer and even a globe-trotter. His publicists can speak more intelligently of world politics and of world interests. He has not only learned foreign languages, but he has been

equally anxious to impart his own. If, by the side of the work done in the schools and lycées, he has the *Société pour la propagation des langues étrangères* in France, and the *Société des études des langues étrangères*, he has also the *Alliance française* whose efforts are to spread the French language in every part of the world.

Education has become the prerogative of nearly every one. In thirty-three years the pupils able to read and write have risen from 52,350 to 73,001; those having a better education from 176,388 to 208,012; those with a diploma of primary education from a small number¹ to 6,226; bachelors of letters, of science, or of any other secondary study from 1,507 to 6,988.² Life itself has become more educational by its travel, its military service, its widely read literature, and the periodical press. The progress of the latter gives us many indices of wider aims and of a larger culture. Of the 84 agricultural papers of to-day 56 were founded under the Republic, an increase of 200 per cent. Of the 22 publications devoted to architecture 15 were started since 1870, that is, a progress of 21 per cent. Of the 62 papers devoted to associations 45, that is, 264 per cent, were created under Republican rule; of the 51 on fine arts 42

¹ 947 in 1878.

² *Annuaire statistique*.

that is, 488 per cent; of the 54 on bibliography 38; of the 59 colonial papers 52; of the 61 on commerce 39; of the 16 on cooking 14; of the 60 papers and reviews upon political, social, and domestic economy 49; of the 16 women's papers 13; of the 270 on finances 177; of the 76 on industry 52; of the 96 on education 74; of the 32 devoted to literature 29; of the 299 for medicine, surgery, and hygiene 225; of the 19 on metallurgy 10; of the 41 on music 28; of the 130 Catholic papers 93; of the 203 reviews, literary, political, and of high culture, 134, and of the 84 scientific papers 56.¹ The evidence of the progress of widening and radiating interest may also be seen in those annual publications devoted to a peculiar subject, as science, art, or life, like the *Année biologique*, *Année psychologique*, *Année politique*, *Année cartographique*, *Année industrielle*, and scores of kindred publications, significant alike for the activities which they record, and for the serious interests which they keep up in a multitude of readers. All these facts point to the growth of a larger culture and intelligence on the part of the French people. Few are the democracies which have witnessed such a deepening of their mental life in such a short time.

¹ *Annuaire de la presse française et étrangère*, 1909. These statistics are not absolutely accurate; but when there was any doubt, the benefit of it was given to the publications of the Second Empire.

With the progress just referred to has come a more specific knowledge in every direction. This has told potently upon sanitary laws and better provisions for general health. The Republic recognises the right of the helpless to receive medical aid from society. The nursing of the poor, like that of the rich, is more and more done by trained persons. Medical science and skill are more available. From 1881 to 1902 the number of doctors has risen from 10,743 to 15,907, *officiers de santé*¹ have fallen from 3,633 to 1,201, but midwives have increased from 5,877 to 13,249, and druggists from 5,661 to 10,248. Those professionally concerned with public health have increased from 25,914 to 40,605.² Medical and surgical societies contribute potently to the efficiency of this service. Public health has become a matter of national concern. Physical culture has rapidly won its way all over the country, notwithstanding the ascetic spirit of the historic Church. Gymnastic and sporting societies of all kinds have been formed to develop the body. Even those who upon religious grounds, objected to this have themselves been compelled to organise athletic organisations and schools of physical culture.

¹ A secondary grade of doctors now much discredited.

² *Annuaire statistique*.

keep their young people. In all educational institutions, this physical training has now some place. A national organisation, *La ligue française de l'éducation physique*, advocates the gospel of a methodic and rational physical education.

Some consequences were bound to follow. One of them is the larger size of Frenchmen. The study of the measurements of conscripts from 1872 to 1905 leaves no doubt as to this.

PERCENTAGE OF THE RELATIVE HEIGHT OF
CONSCRIPTS

	1 m. 54 to 1.62	1 m. 63	1 m. 64	1 m. 65	1.66	1.67 to 1.69	1.70 to 1.72	1.73 and above
1872	31.7	7.2	7.9	8.1	7.4	16.4	11.8	9.5
1905	28.1	6.2	6.4	7.0	6.6	17.7	13.2	12.5

One sees that the decrease from 1 m. 54 to 1 m. 67 is constant and that there is a continuous gain from 1 m. 67 to the greatest height.¹

Another consequence of the new condition is a lower death-rate. This has been most visible in the diminution of infantile mortality. Dr. E. Barthier says that it was 42 per cent for the whole country from 1800 to 1874, and 18 per

¹ *Annuaire statistique*. In 1872, conscripts under 1 m. 54 were not included in statistics, so that the writer does not give them in the report for 1905.

202 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

cent for legitimate and 24 per cent for illegitimate children from 1874 to 1900.¹ Dr. Jacques Bertillon, in a report before the Academy of Medicine of Paris, states the decrease in the mortality of children as follows, taking the average of the last four years of the Empire and the first four years of this century:

CHILDREN FROM BIRTH TO THE AGE OF 4 YEARS	FROM 5 TO 9	FROM 10 TO 14
128.5	10.6	5.2
55.3	5.1	2.9 ²

Children dying under one year of age numbered 147 per thousand in 1872, and 116 in 1906.³ During the same period the death-rate for the nation decreased from 22.5 per thousand to 19.5. From 1872 to 1901 the population from 60 to 79 years of age rose from 3,910,000 to 4,418,000, and that above 80 years from 267,000 to 352,000; in other words, sexagenarians and septuagenarians increased from 10.83 per cent of the total population to 11.50, and octogenarians and nonagenarians from 0.74 to 1.05.⁴ The total number of deaths averaged 848,111 during the period of

¹ *Pages libres*, June 16, 1906.

² *L'Illustration*, Jan. 26, 1907.

³ *Annuaire statistique*.

⁴ *Ibid.*

1884 to 1891, while from 1899 to 1906 the average was only 785,523 — a difference of 62,588 a year.¹

Social conditions have also undergone great changes. While the former classes, not to say castes, still exist, there has been a process of social interpenetration which has introduced Jewesses and Americans into the nobility, the sons of the people into the higher clergy, and new elements into the professional classes. Now the sons choose, more often than under the Empire, a profession other than that of their father; and when they have made a choice, they are not riveted to it for life. The school teachers and the professors, who previously seemed permanently chained to their calling until they were superannuated, now often become journalists, dramatic critics, lecturers, writers, or deputies. Philosophers find a field outside of the schools. Priests leave their church without calling forth the bitter and relentless persecutions of former days. Classes and professions do not, as in by-gone days, hold a man for ever, he may adjust himself to opportunities unknown to his predecessors. Though M. Bazin, in his *La Terre qui meurt*, deplures the fact that French peasants leave agricultural districts, they do so to improve

¹ Théry, *op. cit.*, p. 326.

their material, and often their moral, condition. The greater number of them are right in so doing. By his displacement the peasant learns something. If he returns to his hamlet, as a rule he has received a valuable schooling. The labourer at large may, if he chooses, join the labour organisations which have become numerous and influential. Through them he may secure what formerly was out of his reach.

The most prominent feature of French society during the last forty years has been the voluntary socialisation of men in every realm, giving new hopes and new aspirations. This has been true of philosophers, psychologists, scientists, physicians, surgeons, educators, manufacturers, artists, writers, philanthropists, etc. These societies constitute the most unmistakable evidences of the unparalleled efforts of Frenchmen and of their great united purpose in their several spheres. Everywhere work has become more co-operative and collective. Labour organisations are only parts of this larger movement of co-ordinated action of groups of individuals. Still the unions which band together masses of unreflective toilers, formerly accepting as a divine rule the mischievous iron hand that held them down, is a new phenomenon in French society. Labourers, conscious of their power, have endeav-

oured to rise by association. They have experimented with that principle upon a colossal scale, often making mistakes; not infrequently they have been the victims of their leaders, but in the experience they have risen.

The rise of these large organisations was not without peril for the government and for individual liberty. By the force of things these large bodies were bound to clash with the powers that be. As was to be expected, there were contentions for proper adjustments which French journalists so easily call *crises*—the clerical crisis, the military crisis, the commercial crisis, the labour-union crisis, the vine-grower crisis, the liquor-dealers' and saloon-keepers' crisis, and others. Great organisations in all countries have always, openly or secretly, aspired to lord it over political institutions. The clergy have been prominent in this respect. The army, or rather its chiefs, during the Dreyfus campaign, uttered threats, not a few, against the government; but they knew that soldiers were intensely patriotic as well as Republicans, so that these officers remained loyal. Commercial men have acted as if commercial interests should be paramount and trade considerations should override other national issues. Most of the great labour-unions have shown considerable unrest as if they were

not satisfied with the purpose for which they were organised and wished to lay their hands upon the political machinery for their advantage. Even State servants formed unions which did not shrink from striking, and thereby paralysing the national life.

Potent as the labour-unions are, they represent only one-sixteenth of industrial labourers, and the *Confédération générale du travail*, the most militant body, constitute only 5 per cent of the whole, and only a minority of the members of this organisation is revolutionary.¹ At the same time it must be remembered that, if the nation approves trades-unions, it condemns emphatically the dictatorial aspirations of some groups and the tyranny of others. Strong in their own sphere, they will arouse the whole nation against them as soon as they attempt to go beyond. Again, great organisations will be a check upon one another, and will do for freedom what denominations have accomplished in Protestant countries for religious liberty. With all the restrictions and tyranny which they have exercised, the individual toiler has a better chance in the struggle of life; and notwithstanding the despotism of numbers, individuals have not been prevented from rising. Never had the country

¹ *Le Siècle*, Oct. 13, 1908; *Le Temps*, June 29, 1909.

such a host of self-made men. They are to be seen in every walk of life, in the Church, the army, the universities, the studios of artists, the French Institute, and the most eminent positions of the land. It has been as easy for poor young Brunetière to become the greatest critic of France as for the tanner boy, Félix Faure, to become its president. The road to distinction, through labour and personal worth, has never been wider, though in it, as before, are also the time-servers and politicians who find greater chances for the use of their peculiar talents.

The fundamental working principle of political life has been also modified. Men do not look up as before to State officials, but State officials look up to them. The functionary is at every point concerned with the opinions of the masses, often more than with that of his chiefs. While in former days dealers went to great centres to buy their goods and now drummers bring their wares to the merchant, at the present time government agents serve the citizen in his village or in his hamlet. The villager no longer goes to the county-seat to pay his taxes, but the tax-collector comes to him. Schools, post-offices, telegraphs and telephones, police headquarters, justices of peace, hospitals, and kindred institutions are where men are. To the government

of paternalism on behalf of the classes has succeeded a government of service for the masses. The privileges of the few, with their attendant evils, have become the boon of the many, with similar evils, indeed, but with the difference that now these evils can be attacked freely in parliament, in the courts, or in the press.

The high achievement of the Republic is that, in the great grinding political machinery of France, man counts for more than at any period of her history. Life means more bread and more material well being, more social, more political, and more economic freedom. Citizens have more moral buoyancy, larger intellectual compass, a deeper and a clearer consciousness of their own worth. The tendency may have been to do too much for the lower classes; but one must admit that aristocracy has never had freer opportunities to lead its own wasteful, indolent, and superficial life. Like the nation, it has grown richer and in some ways better. Marriages with rich heiresses, Jewish or American, have brought new blood and new moral energy among them. They do not now have the contempt of former days for work. Some of them have become leaders in great industries, and not a few have won distinction in other realms. According to Comte G. d'Avenel there has been

an unconscious democratisation of the nobility.¹ There has been among them a considerable infiltration of the moral ideas which have so deeply affected Republicans. Similarly, it is an encouraging fact that nobles of genuine moral worth, like M. de Mun, for instance, have never been more respected.

With all its falterings, the present government is the least objectionable and the longest which the country has had since Louis XV, and the most progressive which the French people have ever known. When one examines the innumerable evidences of the progress of the nation, one grows indignant at the ignorance or bad faith of the reactionaries who speak of its "decadence." The writer has asked some of them what period of French history they would choose in preference to that of to-day—a period in which a man of large culture and generous impulse would rather live. The reign of Louis XIV? or that of Louis XV? The Revolution? The First Empire with its wars and its despotism? The *Restauration* with its blind and revengeful reactions? The grey, commonplace *bourgeois* reign of the Orleanists? The Second Empire, with the *Coup d'Etat*, ending at Sedan with an interlude of eighteen years of an unblush-

¹ *Ce qu'il reste d'aristocratie in Les Français de mon temps.*

ing absolutism and corruption? No! No! In some way or other, they are all compelled to admit that Republican France of to-day stands upon a higher plane, is working out a better and a broader civilisation, notwithstanding all the evils that there, as elsewhere, are the shadows in a beautiful picture.

To the impertinent question which no intelligent student should ask, "Is France declining?" Max Nordau answered wisely, "There are in France certain social groups and classes which are absolutely declining. But this is fortunate for the country. France itself is rapidly progressing, and is at present passing through one of the most brilliant periods of its history. Morally and intellectually France stands in the forefront among civilised nations. Its science, its literature, and its art are superior to most of them and inferior to none. France occupies now a position to which others will come later. The only dark point on its horizon might be the decrease of births. But here also France is again a precursor. The same demographic phenomena follow inevitably the advance of civilisation. And when this is repeated elsewhere, it ceases to be a source of anxiety. It is simply an expression of the fact that the reason and foresight of the nation make themselves evident in a domain

where a lower grade of civilisation permits blind instinct to decide. The Frenchman who is not proud of his nation must be a highly peculiar and ungrateful individual.”¹

To the same question Edmund Gosse replied: “My answer is decidedly and emphatically, ‘No!’ What does the word ‘decline’ mean? Is it not an expression which scared people often use to conceal their fear of everything that is new, bold, and progressive? The only declining peoples are those who do not dare to make a change, who are always afraid to encourage new movements. Strong, powerful nations are always making new experiments, which cause the timid to tremble and cry out. Wherever we look around us in the world we find no nation of which it can more unjustly be said that it is in decline than France. In my opinion there is no country so full of intellectual buoyancy and hopefulness, no country which offers the observer so many sources of real life, and which so fascinates the thinker as France. Is France in decline? If by decline you mean development, life’s most painful metamorphosis — Yes! But if by decline you mean ennui, impotence, decline in the moral and intellectual temperature — a thousand times No!”²

¹ *Boston Transcript*, May 9, 1904.

² *Ibid.*

CHAPTER XI

MORAL INSTRUCTION IN FRENCH SCHOOLS ¹

THE greatest and the most promising work of the French Republic during the last thirty years is that which she has done for education. "Thanks," says M. Fouillée, "to a noble and generous *mouvement*, Republican France, at the end of the nineteenth century, has adorned herself with schools, as, after the terror of the year 1000, she adorned herself with churches." Pasteur, surveying, on a memorable occasion, what had been done for education, exclaimed, "Everything, from the village schools to the laboratories, has either been founded or renovated." Interest in education has become intense. Faith in the power of the school has eclipsed, in many parts of the land, faith in the efficiency of the Church. The changes in the educational spirit are no less marked. The central aim of education, which was for so long the

¹ Reprinted from *The Educational Review*, April, 1902.

enlargement of the mind, has also become the direction of conduct and the development of character.

It was said by the Conservatives that the freedom — which they call license — of the Republic would be fatal to morality and religion. Whatever may have been the moral excesses of a period of transition, it is certain that there has been awakened a sense of responsibility never before known in the history of France. One sees its expression in the multitude of organisations having a philanthropic or a moral purpose; in the new tone in art; in polite literature; in the importance which moral and religious questions have come to assume. To this, more than to any other cause, must be ascribed the deepening religious seriousness visible in many parts of the country, and the great prominence of moral questions in the schools.

Twenty years ago the Catholic Church had still virtual control of French education.¹ Symbols of Catholic faith were found everywhere in school buildings. The catechism was on a par with arithmetic, and Roman Catholic prayers were recited several times a day, notwith-

¹ During the last days of the Empire the common school teacher was trained, and compelled, to teach the Roman Catholic catechism, to learn to sing the plain chant, and to take organ lessons in view of the Catholic Church service.

standing the presence of non-Catholics. So great was the power of the clergy that, in places not a few, the local priest became a real despot for the local teacher. This was an anachronism which could not last. In 1882 the parliament — after long and stormy discussions — voted the secularisation of the common schools. Instead of the religious practices and the mechanical teaching of the catechism, the teaching of morals was introduced, and great efforts were made, in a new way, for the improvement of character. This was not simply the liberation of the schools from ecclesiastical dominion, but also the assertion that under that régime they had failed in their moral education. As expected, the clergy carried on a most violent campaign against the parliament and pushed forward the extension of a vast system of parochial schools in opposition to the “atheistic” and the “godless” schools of the Republic.¹

Sacrifice on account of principles is always

¹ The Catholic Church has continued her antagonism to the common schools, to the moral teaching in them, and to the teachers in such a way as to create bitter feelings on both sides. Have not the bishops condemned Lavissee, *Histoire de France*, an impartial little history written by a great historian who is the soul of impartiality? Have not these same bishops condemned the text-books of morals because there is nothing in them upon the supernatural or about “the doctrine of the original sin”? To please them the government should eliminate all the books disapproved by the clergy; in other words, the bishops should have the upper hand. This French democracy will not allow.

beautiful. To have, by their own gifts, in the face of State-paid institutions, maintained schools which educate one-third of the children of the primary, and nearly one-half of the secondary, schools is no small achievement performed by the Catholics. With them moral teaching is almost always confounded with religious instruction, and morality is the unconditional surrender to the voice of the Church. As some one has said, this moral teaching can have serious and lasting value only for those who have faith—and will keep it—but when confidence in the Church ceases the sense of moral imperativeness disappears. Fortunately, to supplement their schools, the Catholics have created many splendidly devised organisations to keep their young people in touch with the schools as they enter their apprenticeship or go to work. They are thus under a great moral and religious influence through the schools, even after they have left them. A Catholic writer¹ rightly regrets that these efforts have been “a work of preservation, rather than one of formation.” This was to be expected. These schools continue the old traditional education of the Church. Still we must remember that, by a kind of intellectual and moral infiltration much of the life of the present

¹ Max Turmann, *Au sortir de l'école*, p. 73.

time penetrates into those institutions in which mediæval ideals are still so greatly cherished.

Nothing served the common schools after 1882 like the bitter attacks of the clergy. At first the people were anxious, but when the nature of the moral teaching was known they gradually approved it. The teachers, at the outset frightened by their new duties, hesitated, but when their fitness to teach morals was assailed—not entirely without cause—they showed a noble determination to do what they could. The government founded a special normal school for men at St. Cloud and one for women at Fontenay-aux-roses to provide suitable teachers of morals for all the normal, and thereby for the common, schools of the country. The lack of competent teachers for this work was then, and is still to some extent, one of the difficulties in the way. Specific training in this matter is less important than character. As a whole, the body of French teachers has a high moral standing, because teaching is not for them a temporary makeshift, but a life. Were one to judge of their character by their small number of criminals the result would be most satisfactory, for the liberal professions reach an average of 6.35 per thousand where the teachers have only 1.58. As an evidence of their altruistic spirit, it is suf-

ficient to say that no less than thirty-five thousand have, for several winters, taught without compensation in evening schools.

The teachers showed their superiority by making a right use of the criticisms of their opponents. They admitted that French common schools were only too often soulless teaching machines; they recognised the necessity of making them living centres of moral power. The pupil must learn no less, but his learning must express itself in terms of moral life. He must, at all cost, be protected from the great evils without, and strengthened in his life within. For the work of external moral preservation there were gradually founded numerous organisations, the *mutualités scolaires*, a kind of mutual-help society; the *amicales*, the grouping of former pupils for social ends; the *patronages*, to look after former pupils during their apprenticeship; the *classes de garde*, to keep until evening the children whose parents are at work during the day; anti-alcoholic leagues, societies for the protection of useful animals; literary entertainments, and other means of keeping former pupils in a wholesome moral atmosphere. In accordance with the doctrine of evolution, they endeavoured to shelter the prolonged infancy of man, when home and Church are inadequate, with the influ-

ences of the schools. The great thing, however, was to strengthen the inner child. Without surrendering any effort for the mental development of the pupils — while increasing every provision to secure greater intellectual efficiency — great stress was laid upon their moral development by the very means the results of which so far had been mere intellectuality. Languages, mathematics, literature, history, and other studies, aside from their specific aim, must at the same time yield, a certain training of the will. Every exercise of the school must secure results in which, when possible, thought, feeling, volition, and action would be but four inseparable steps to character. The teacher must always keep this great end in mind. He must insist upon merit rather than upon rank. In cases of misdemeanour he must make the pupil his own judge; when possible he must be made to see the relations of the penalty to the fault. He must place around his pupils a healthy, inspiring moral atmosphere. He must become the auxiliary of morality, as formerly he was the auxiliary of religion. It is clear that in twenty years a great change has taken place in French education in the direction of moral teaching. This must not be confounded, however, with the teaching of morals.

When this branch of instruction was inaugurated in France, the country had the good fortune to have the programme formulated by competent men in the Ministry of Education — men who thoroughly studied the difficult problem. These, in turn, received the co-operation of some of the best minds of France in the preparation of text-books. Among these writers we read the names of Paul Janet, A. Mézières, Paul Bert, Abbé de Broglie, G. Compayré, Mme. Coignet, Henry Gréville, Henry Marion, Ch. Renouvier, Jules Simon, Jules Steeg — men and women foremost in the literary and the philosophical world. They put into these books, each one in his own way, the fundamental principles of morality. They gave expression to the national conscience in a didactic form. Thus the parliament decreed that the moral education of 6,000,000 French children should be attempted by 124,000 teachers;¹ specialists formulated an ideal programme; the teachers did much to meet the demands of this new departure, and conspicuous writers admirably stated in their books various ways to reach a common goal.

Morals in the schools are not always taught from books, but sometimes by brief, earnest

¹ Jean Izoulet, *La cité moderne*, p. 471.

talks, prepared by the teacher from the books. They are imparted to children from five to seven in a mere oral form by the simplest way possible. Here the teaching does not go further than to say that this act is right and that is wrong. The great end is intense moral culture by emotions. With the other classes the greater number of teachers use books. In the elementary primary class, from seven to nine, instruction is generally by means of narratives, illustrations, and quotations bearing upon the immediate relations of the pupils among themselves. The effort is not so much to enlighten the moral consciousness as to secure the immediate introduction of principles into life. This instruction must be in touch with events in the daily life of the pupils. The programme of Jules Ferry puts it as follows:

The teacher must use concrete examples and appeals to the immediate experience of the children in order to develop in them moral emotions and inspire them with feelings of admiration for the universal order — with religious feelings by calling their attention to scenery of great natural beauty — with feelings of charity by pointing out to them sufferings to relieve, giving thereby some real act of charity to accomplish with discretion — with feelings of gratitude and sympathy by the account of a courageous deed, or by a visit to a charitable institution, etc.¹

¹ *Programmes officiels du 27 juillet, 1882.*

In the middle primary class, from nine to eleven, the programme centres upon duties toward parents, servants, classmates, the fatherland, and God. The method used with the preceding class is continued, but with more order and precision. Here again one is impressed with the same intense purpose of moral utility which we have already noticed. In the superior primary class — that is, from eleven to thirteen — the work includes the study of the elementary principles of morality, concluded with a special study of social morality. In the secondary schools great stress is laid upon moral education,¹ but the teaching of morals has also its place. Here the scope might be stated as follows: Primary moral notions. Domestic, social, and personal duties. All this remains intensely practical and even dogmatic. In the last year of *lycée* and *collège* work ethics constitute an invaluable part of the course of philosophy.

The text-books used in this work are intended for a certain stage of mental development, that is, for some definite classes. Some are also for candidates to normal schools,² for teachers, for

¹ Alfred Croisset, *L'éducation morale dans l'université*, Paris, 1901.

² Abbé de Broglie, *Dieu, la conscience, le devoir*, Paris, 1889; A. Pierre and A. Martin, *Cours de morale théorique et pratique*, Paris, 1901.

families,¹ and for general moral culture.² In many cases they combine morals and civics, and not infrequently the rudiments of common law. One of the text-books greatly used³ gives (1) moral precepts; (2) stories illustrating them; (3) a vocabulary of the most difficult words used; (4) questions to see whether the pupil has understood well, or to drive the precepts home; (5) compositions which, in their own way, serve a similar purpose. Another⁴ proceeds in a similar manner, but its contents are so arranged as to be distributed through the months of the school year. October is devoted to the family, November to the school, December and January to the fatherland, and so on to June, which deals with responsibility, habit, sanctions of the moral law, duties toward God, and the immortality of the soul. The various text-books devoted to higher forms of primary teaching of morals are much more substantial. In addition to clear expositions of the subject there are references to well-known passages of literature to illustrate a point. Thus in the chapter on conscience, several refer to Hugo's poem, *La Conscience*.⁵ Some are rich

¹ G. Manuel, *Nouveau livre de morale pratique*, Paris, 1901.

² M. Dugard, *La culture morale*.

³ Pierre Laloi, *L'année d'instruction morale et civique*, Paris, 1900.

⁴ Bailly and Dodey, *Morale pratique de l'écolier*, Paris, 1896.

⁵ F. Lapeyre, *Leçons d'instruction morale*, Paris, 1901; O. Pavette *a morale mise à la portée des enfants*, Paris, 1901.

in brilliant quotations of thoughts and maxims from all literatures, and others, like the little book of Paul Janet,¹ have clear-cut definitions which greatly facilitate the grasping of moral distinctions. The books for *lycées* and *collèges* are remarkable in this respect.² One of the best books in this collection gives,³ after each chapter, a *résumé* in brief related propositions which make the book luminous. Another⁴ has many tabular views exhibiting, side by side, the rights as well as the duties of the child, and three synoptical views of those duties, so arranged as to be easily remembered in their interrelations. Another still⁵ closes each chapter with resolutions. The manuals devoted to ethics have a more speculative character, but the books just referred to are devoted to morality as an art and not as a science. It is not to be understood that these books are all equally satisfactory; some are childish, superficial, or are badly printed and illustrated; others, very few indeed, are anti-religious, but, as a whole, they represent a fine body of pedagogic literature. The impression

¹ *Petits éléments de morale*, Paris, 1884.

² Pontsevrez, *Cours de morale pratique*, Paris, 1896; Ch. Adam, *Cours de morale pratique*, Paris, 1893.

³ J. Gérard, *Morale*, Delagrave, Paris.

⁴ Curé and Houzelle, *Leçons de morale*, Paris, 1900.

⁵ O. Pavette, *op. cit.*

left by the series is their concrete character, their variety, their simplicity, and the moral earnestness of the writers.

It is impossible that such books, from so many sources and such varied inspiration, should have that unity of moral conception which would satisfy those who place all ethical considerations above that of individual or social utility. The great diversity, however, is more often one of verbal expression than of real practical difference. Not infrequently the strong political or religious bias of a writer gives a slight one-sided colouring to his statements. Some are greatly concerned about certain national tendencies. One, alarmed by the internationalism of Socialists, lays great emphasis upon the duties of patriotism; another has at heart the overthrow of traditional superstitions. One is impressed with the urgent necessity of opposing alcoholism with new vigour; and another, having seen the evil of religious bigotry, insists upon the duty of toleration. Almost all have laid special stress upon particular points, and only a few have neglected important ones. The remarkable fact is the quasi-unanimity as to what acts are moral and what are not. While the morals taught are often placed upon empirical grounds, and should be, the programme

demands that the teachers should assert in the classroom "the imperative and disinterested character of duty."¹ This provision — if we are to judge from the text-books — is not always carried out, but when the imperativeness of this or that particular act is concerned, there is absolute unanimity. It cannot be doubted that these text-books have a clearer ring of the categorical imperative than those taught in the parochial schools. Last January (1901), Deputy Trouillot, in the French parliament, called attention to cases of scandalous casuistry in a Latin manual used in sixty-seven Catholic seminaries of France. A Roman Catholic priest, member of the parliament, Abbé Gayraud, dared to defend publicly mental reservations and the subterfuges of casuistry. He made the statement that falsehoods are allowable, provided they hurt no one. In the text-books of secular education which the writer has seen there is a positiveness in reference to right and wrong acts — no middle ground — which is a contrast to the equivocations in the work assailed by Deputy Trouillot. As a whole, were the ideals of moral life imparted by these text-books compared with those set forth by the Founder of Christianity, one could not escape the con-

¹ *Programmes officiels du 27 juillet, 1882.*

clusion that they are very much alike, not to say identical.¹

This brings us to the religious aspect of this teaching of morals. Indeed, "religious instruction" so-called is forbidden by law, but obviously the French legislators gave to the word "religious" a peculiar sense. By it, they certainly meant to do away with clerical interference, with the teaching of a truncated religious history, with a denominational catechism, the Roman Catholic prayers, and other religious features associated with Catholicism. Some of the legislators wished, even, to eliminate the word "God" from all text-books, but they failed. That the measure was not anti-religious is evident from the fact that the law distinctly states that the schools shall be closed Sundays and Thursdays so that the children may, if their parents wish, receive religious instruction in the churches.² Another proof is the official doctrine of the State, which reads as follows:

The teacher is not to give a course of instruction *ex professo* upon the nature and attributes of God. His les-

¹ Jules Ferry was in favour of having taught in the schools "Our Duties toward God," and as a matter of fact that subject was taught; but he was unwilling to have this inserted into the law of 1882, lest the bishops should take advantage of it for the purpose of interfering with the schools. (J.-L. de Lanesson, *Le Siècle*, 1909.)

² All the children of the parochial schools and a large part of those from the common schools attend the Catholic Sunday and Thursday

sons for all must be confined to two points: First, he teaches his pupils not to pronounce lightly the name of God; he associates closely in their mind the idea of a First Cause and a Perfect Being with feelings of respect and veneration; he accustoms each of them to give to this notion of God the same respect, even though that should be different from the teacher's own convictions. Secondly, and independently from the special instructions of different denominations, the teacher will endeavour to have the child understand and feel that the first homage which he owes to God is obedience to his laws, such as they are revealed to him by his conscience and his reason.¹

After this one is not astonished to hear Professor Buisson, of the University of Paris, when taking up the gauntlet about the "godless schools," exclaim: "Our schools are schools without priests, but not schools without God." Certainly they are not without God, though the theistic position is not so absolute as it would seem. In twenty text-books of morals, chosen at random, sixteen teach the existence of God and duties toward Him. The four remaining ones might be viewed by some as a concession to radicalism, though more properly they should be considered as honourable attempts to place

schools where, at least for a part of the year, they study the catechism. The Protestants have about seventy thousand children in their Sunday and Thursday schools.

¹ Comte G. d'Avenel, a distinguished Catholic, speaking of moral teachings in the schools, says: "There is no public school where is taught as to 'good' and 'evil' anything else than what is found in the catechism." (*Les Français de mon temps*, p. 212.)

the teaching of morals upon a basis absolutely independent of religion, without any hostility toward it. One cannot say as much of the Christological attitude of all these writers. Admitting that in such matters one is justified in taking a purely human view of the Christ, it seems absolutely unscientific for those who speak historically of morals to avoid all references to him. The men who quote profusely Plato, Aristotle, Epictetus, La Fontaine, Voltaire, Rousseau, and Rabelais refrain even from the least allusion to Jesus, whom such radical thinkers as John Stuart Mill and Renan proclaimed the greatest moral teacher of all times. Most of them,¹ however, strengthen their moral teaching with the theistic idea, and several text-books approve external worship and speak of prayer.

This teaching derives additional importance from the fact that, in another way, it is also given in the classes of philosophy. The changes in this realm have been numerous, the old *spiritualisme* which was taught often by materialists has been replaced by neo-Kantism taught by idealists. The statement in the official programme has been but slightly modified, but it is taught in a new spirit. Duty, moral freedom,

¹ These statements refer only to the twenty text-books examined by the writer.

God, and immortality have remained central in the philosophical teaching of the secondary schools, and whatever the churches may wish to add to these cardinal facts, they are the cornerstones of religion. Are not the following questions, which were given for admission to the Superior Normal School of Sèvres, religious? "State the principal reasons which warrant us in hoping for another life." "Is God revealed to our reason, or apprehended by our feelings?" "Religious duties." "Providence." "The Existence of God." "Relations of godliness to virtue." Obviously we are here in the presence of that which is essentially religious. To teach the existence of a God who finds pleasure in seeing men obey the moral law, to cultivate respect and reverence for that God, is certainly religious in the largest sense of the term. Of course there are teachers who eschew this part of the work — and many of them; others do it poorly, but the majority do it. Almost all the teachers think that a mere intellectual training, without the moral, is inadequate, and many hold that a moral education without a theistic foundation, or other religious concomitants, is weak and frail.

This tendency has been so pronounced that already a reaction is in sight. Among other

signs of it are the recent meeting of a teachers' association in Bordeaux and one of the *Ligue pour l'Enseignement* in Caen, when resolutions were passed urging that that part of moral instruction referring to God be dropped.¹ There can be no better proof of the religious value of this education than the opposition of radicalism. A Catholic writer, not friendly toward these schools, referring to the place of God in this education, calls it "the share of the Divine."² Another writer ascribes to this teaching that ideal justice which is the soul of religion.³ M. Paul Sabatier says: "Thanks to the teaching of morals, there is being constituted, little by little, among us a kind of lay church. It is a reformation, true, deep, noiseless, outside of the churches but not against them."

It is difficult to gauge the results of a work like this. After centuries of experience, there are still those who question the moral influence of the Church, of science, and of art. There are those who view this experiment as a failure because they had expected sudden moral transformations, which are impossible. The Catholic clergy condemned the system before it had

¹ This anti-religious spirit has become more and more pronounced of late.

² *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 juin, 1898.

³ B. Jacob, *Pour l'école laïque*, p. 33.

been tried in one single school. The Duc de Broglie attacked it¹ most violently, insisting that the "godless schools" were already showing their baneful fruition in the alarming increase in the number of youthful criminals. When they say that the morals taught in the schools are powerless because they lack theoretical unity and Church help, they might be answered that it is impossible to do more poorly than they with their boasted adjuncts. The writer does not underrate the advantages of teaching morals with the support of a historic religion, but that can no longer be done in France. Again, it seems to him that a system of morals resting upon the theistic idea is more efficient than the one which makes the theistic idea to stand upon the categorical imperative, but even this view of morals can no longer be pressed in a country in which the philosophers stand by the *Critique of the Practical Reason* of Kant. They insist that morality does not depend upon the idea of God, but that the idea of God rests upon the sense of oughtness in us. This point of view cannot be taken by all, for many teach a utilitarian morality. Obviously, it is impossible to secure theoretical unity, but a practical one is possible. Again, the teachers do not all show the same

¹ *Histoire et politique*, 1897, p. 435.

spirit and zeal, but, as a whole, the essential parts of the programmes are fairly carried out.

After making allowances for necessary imperfections, some practical results must follow. The teachers dispel an enormous amount of moral ignorance, a result of no mean importance. They assert the merits and demerits of certain acts which, in the mind of the pupils, become forces of moral suggestions. With this comes either the quickening of sympathy for moral, or of aversion for unmoral and immoral, acts. This is embodied in life by the continued effort to transform all this thinking and feeling into moral energy. There is, above all, the constant inspiration of higher ideals. Higher moral ideas and ideals must necessarily act as determinants of feelings and volitions for a higher life.

It should be remembered that this teaching is correlated with a general *ensemble* of efforts and life described at the outset of this chapter; an *ensemble* which intensifies the power of this teaching of morals. The writer has not the least hesitancy in admitting that the practical results have not come up to the original theoretical expectations, but this is also the case with the parochial schools. Honest teachers on both sides have not failed to express their disappointment at the results of their work. However, numer-

ous investigations have shown tangible results. In 1889 Dean Lichtenberger, of the Faculty of Protestant Theology of Paris, examined 558 reports from as many inspectors of schools from every part of the country. The variety of the reports and the discriminating sincerity of the inspectors, so severe toward their own work, lead one to see how Dean Lichtenberger could reach no other conclusion than that the work represented "a manifest progress." Numerous correspondents have spoken in a similar manner. One of them, inspector over two hundred schools, writes: "The teaching of morals gives results more and more satisfactory. It is not perfect as yet, but progress has been made which is an encouragement to persevere." Another, speaking of the fruits of this education, says: "I know men who have had no other training than that of the common schools, and yet men who, by their intelligence and their moral elevation, are certainly among the greatest personal forces of modern France." A distinguished writer says: "We have already some admirable results. I need not tell you that they are extremely variable. . . . The reaction upon the teachers themselves has been superb. They have, at least many among them, realised the part which they must play as educators." The full value of this

234 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

new departure in French schools cannot as yet be gauged by corresponding results. It is probable that its wisdom will not be absolutely demonstrated by adequate returns until the time when the pupils, trained in the schools, have homes of their own, and in the education of their children co-operate with the schools — until the time when the Church, ceasing her opposition, and supplementing the work of the schools, gives them an honest support. Meanwhile, with their manifest imperfections, the schools have become institutions, not only to make the pupils think, but think right, then feel right, then will right, then do right, and finally be right, the permanence of which is character. The number of those who will go through all the stages of this ethical ascent may not be great at first, but multitudes will doubtless be lifted up, morally, a little higher. Later on, this great moral lever, working with cumulative force, will direct the energies which make for the better life of France.

CHAPTER XII

EXTRACTS FROM TEXT-BOOKS OF MORAL INSTRUCTION USED IN FRENCH SCHOOLS¹

DURING the crisis which followed the separation of Church and State, the dignitaries of the Roman Communion all over the world joined the Pope and French bishops in their protests against that virtual revolution. In the heat of excitement Cardinal Gibbons and other American prelates centred their attacks upon the French schools, though these schools are merely alluded to in the text of the Separation Law. One can scarcely read the utterances of a single American bishop, at that time, without finding the ever-repeated charge that the teaching of the schools is atheistic. The Cardinal of Baltimore even ascribes to M. Briand words which express a militant attitude against all religion — words which the distinguished French minister never uttered or wrote,² but which represent him as a militant opponent of all religions. Having

¹ Translated by Miss H. de S. Blanding.

² P. Sabatier, *Lettre ouverte à S. E. Le Cardinal Gibbons*, p. 9.

already discussed similar accusations against Republicans, it has occurred to the writer that the most convincing answer to such accusations was to give characteristic extracts of the text-books used in the schools, which bear upon this question. In 1901 twenty text-books were ordered from Paris with the strict specification that they should not only be representative, but in actual use in the schools. Of these, sixteen teach the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. The remaining four, free from anything irreligious, may be considered as an honest attempt to teach an empirical morality without any religious support. The character of the greater number of those books is the best refutation of the charges. When some time ago the writer read some of these extracts at Carnegie Hall in New York, several journalists stated that the citizens of the Empire State would not tolerate so much religious teaching in the public schools. Professor Barrett Wendell, after visiting the *lycée* of Lille, where he saw clergymen teaching religion, said: "Even under this extremely anti-clerical government, it proved, there was a degree of dogmatic teaching at the expense of the State, which would not be tolerated by the public opinion of any city in America."¹

¹ *The France of To-day*, p. 39.

Testimonies like this could be multiplied, but extracts from text-books will be more eloquent.

OUR DUTIES TOWARD GOD

Man cannot doubt the existence of God; and since God exists, what must we conclude?

We must conclude that we have duties to fulfil toward him, namely, to know, love, and serve him.

These are our duties all laid out before us. This definition is excellent; in fact, it answers everything. To know, to love, and to serve God: these three things include the whole man and comprise all his duties. A contemporary philosopher, M. Jules Simon, in speaking of religious duties, declares that no philosopher could do better than to repeat the very formulæ of the catechism on this question.

To know God is to study his works, to devote to him our intellects, to accustom our minds to dwell upon that supreme ideal of perfection which is the key to all knowledge and the source of all enlightenment. The more learning one has, the better can one know and understand the works of God. Our first duty then is to endeavour to instruct ourselves.

To love God is to pay him homage from our hearts, to feel how infinitesimal we are in his sight, to realize how greatly our fleeting existence needs to rely upon his eternal being. How would it be possible not to love with all the strength of our souls this supreme benefactor who has done all for us?

To serve God, lastly, is to submit to his commands, to do his will. For the will of God is that justice be done, that goodness be made manifest, and that virtue be practised.

The practice of our duties toward God constitutes wor-

ship. If the acts by which we worship God, if our love, respect, and gratitude toward him are confined within our souls, the form of worship may be called internal; if these acts are outwardly manifested, the form is called external.

Are these two forms of worship useful?

Yes, my child; man is a combination of soul and body, and it is not too much that he employ all the forces of his being in fulfilling his duties toward God. Mankind, says Fénelon, could not recognise and love its creator without showing its love, without wishing to express this love in festivals, in ceremonies, and with a magnificence proportionate to the object of its affection.¹

DUTIES TOWARD GOD

Who has made the world you see before you, these forests, these prairies, these rivers, these living creatures, this sun that warms you, and these thousands of stars that brighten the summer nights?

You have already answered, my children. A sacred name has come to your lips which you must never pronounce without respect: that of God.

The most celebrated scientist of England, Newton, uncovered his head each time that he spoke or heard speak of God.

You see the constant order of the laws of the universe, the regularity of the seasons, the changes taking place in the plants that grow in springtime and wither in autumn, the succession of night and day, cold and heat, drought and rain. Everything is thus directed by a supreme will to which almost all peoples in all ages have given the same name.

It is from God also that moral law is derived.

The difference that you perceive, my children, between

¹ Mlle Clarisse Juranville, *Manuel d'éducation morale et d'instruction civique*, pp. 223-224.

good and evil, the satisfaction that you feel in doing right, the regret your faults cause you, the freedom of choice that makes you responsible for your actions, all these reveal to you a higher law.

You have within you an ideal of perfection which you do not realise, toward which thousands of you aspire without attaining it. This ideal comes to you directly from the supreme being, the perfect being, namely, from God. He has engraved it in your hearts that you may strive to become like him through virtue. As an ancient philosopher has said, "Likeness to God is virtue."

The greater your virtue, the greater will seem to you the beauty of the divine model. The first duty that you owe it is consequently obedience to the laws which your conscience and your reason reveal to you.

These laws express God's will. He who violates them, exposes himself to a punishment of which God alone is judge. He who observes them deserves a reward which divine justice will not refuse him.

When we think of this omnipotence of God, this right of punishing or of rewarding all acts in accordance with their deserts, which belongs to him alone, we are overcome with respect and awe.

Furthermore, as a great philosopher has said, "If we consider that this omnipotent being wished to create us — us, of whom he had no need; that in creating us, he has showered blessings upon us; that he has given us this universe in which to enjoy its ever-renewed beauties; that he has endowed us with a mind to think, a heart to love, a freedom of will — then we are filled with a gratitude and love for him that must needs express itself in adoration and prayer.

Obedience, reverence, love—these are consequently our duties toward God.¹

¹ A. Mézières, *Education morale et instruction civique*, pp. 114–116.

A HIGHER POWER

We are brought face to face with this inevitable dilemma: since the harmony of virtue and happiness is an ideal not realised in this world, we must either renounce our faith in justice which proclaims the necessity of this harmony, or admit that the injustice of the present life be remedied by the greater harmony of another existence, and that the incomplete, imperfect judgments of this world will find elsewhere their full perfection.

But in this question, for us the most important of all questions, we cannot renounce our faith in justice without disclaiming justice herself, that is, without giving up that which is the foundation of all human institutions, the aim of all civilisation and of all progress. We cannot deny justice without denying humanity.

The result is, then, that we must believe in the immortality of our being as it is in its higher essence, in the reason and the liberty that make us truly men. Morality is but begun in the present life; it will continue in another existence where the harmony of happiness and virtue will be established according to the dictates of justice.

There is no stronger proof of immortality and none stronger can exist, since its strength is exactly equal to the strength of our faith in justice, and since there is no medium between admitting this twofold faith or rejecting it.

But belief in immortality does not suffice to establish the rule of justice. Why need we continue to live if the conditions of life were not to change, if order were not to succeed disorder, if reason in the end were not truth? For this principle of right and of justice cannot take place of itself, and from faith in immortality we are led necessarily to belief in a Providence eminently just and

good, omnipotent in knowing all our actions and all our intentions, and in proportioning our reward to our deserts.

Thus the religious instinct of man is justified, and to the need that we feel of reverting to a primary cause and to a perfect intellect to explain the existence and the order of the physical world is added, to confirm and elucidate it, the need of finding in this same God the supreme principle of perfection and of justice; the supreme consciousness which enlightens all consciousness, and upon which all consciousness depends; which reveals itself to us here below through moral law, the expression of its perfection; and which satisfies fully in a higher life the faith in justice which God has placed in us.

The belief in the immortality of the soul, and the belief in Providence have been called the two postulates of moral consciousness. As the uniformity of geometric truths depends upon postulates, that is, upon truths which reason must of necessity admit, though it can give no exact demonstration of them, so our moral faith, our faith in virtue and in justice, presupposes these two sublime beliefs, which we cannot prove as we would a theorem, but which we cannot doubt without doubting duty and virtue.¹

GOD

Consider the universe: it is immense, and in all its workings there is an order which you must admire.

Thus, upon our earth we see the change of seasons, the vegetation of plants, the continual reproduction of animals.

Beyond our earth there are other worlds where everything is regulated as upon ours.

¹ J. Gérard, *Morale*, pp. 316-317.

Whenever order is found there must be a creator who produces it; this creator is God.

Render thanks to God and worship his wisdom and power.¹

GOD

We cannot look upon a fine work, painting, statue, or building without asking at once the name of the painter, sculptor, or architect; we cannot read a good book, a beautiful piece of prose or of poetry without wishing to know the author; we cannot see an ingenious piece of mechanism without wishing to discover the name of the inventor.

But there are sights more beautiful than all the works of human hands: these are the splendors of nature, the vast sea, the verdant earth, the azure vault of the heavens, the sky sparkling with stars. There is a work much grander and more perfect than all the creations of man's genius: this is the universe, with the countless host of heavenly bodies, suns, stars, planets, and comets, which compose it.

Whenever we contemplate these wonders our minds inevitably rise toward the omnipotent being who is the author of them, and our hearts are filled both with wonder at his works and with veneration for him.

It is not only the grandeur and the beauty of the universe which impress us, it is the order and the harmony which reign in it. We feel and perceive that it obeys unalterable laws, and these laws proclaim their author.

If we turn to the consideration of mankind, if we observe the marvellous combination of the many different organs which compose our bodies and maintain movement and life; if we reflect that the body, with its organs, its senses,

¹ Pierre Laloi, *L'année préparatoire d'instruction morale*, pp. 65-66.

EXTRACTS FROM TEXT-BOOKS 243

and its members, is subject to the will, and that this will is enlightened by reason and ruled by conscience, how can we admit that so wonderful a being is the product of chance?

Thus everything reveals to us the existence and the power of God: the universe, by its beauty, its grandeur, and its laws; man, by the wonderful combination of his organs, by his reason, his intelligence, his conscience, and by the moral law engraved in his heart.¹

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

God exists. The universal opinion of mankind certifies the fact. The order of the universe proves it. The moral order of the world insists upon it.

(1) Wherever man is to be found he is religious. Everywhere he invokes one or many superior powers in nature. He may deceive himself as to the nature of God, but he cannot mistake his existence.

(2) The order of the universe, the regular revolutions of the heavenly bodies, the wonders of the animal world, the skilful mechanism of the human body — everything proves the existence of an intelligent creator. A poet has said, "The universe troubles me; I cannot think that this clock exists without a clockmaker."

(3) God is not the author of the physical world alone; he is the creator of the moral order. He is indispensable to humanity as law-giver and as judge. It is he, as we have seen, who subjects us to moral law; it is he who is the executor of this law.

Moreover, the order of nature being at one with itself, and in perfect harmony, there can be but one God, who, as embodying the principle of physical order, is called wisdom, and as the embodiment of the principle of moral

¹ M. Vessiot, *Cours et méthode d'enseignement moral*, pp. 27-28.

244 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

order is called justice and goodness. Finally, since we must believe that this order instituted by God is watched over and preserved by him, God, considered as guarding the world and guiding it toward his appointed goal, is called Providence.¹

DUTIES TOWARD GOD

My child, all duties which you have to perform may be considered duties toward God. The first duty which you owe the Divinity is to resign yourself to his will. This will is the moral law which God has placed in your conscience, and which is revealed to you through your reason.

The universe is very beautiful; it is a sublime spectacle that one cannot contemplate without admiration. But there is something more beautiful still, that is the moral law in the depths of our souls. "Two things," says a philosopher, "fill the soul with an ever-renewed and increasing wonder and reverence, the more often and the more deeply we reflect upon them: the starry heavens above, and the moral law within."

As has been mentioned in the *Instructions* which accompany the official schedule, you have probably become already familiar with the idea of a God who is the creator of the universe and the father of mankind. You must feel respect and veneration for the Supreme Being. You must always have the same respect for the idea of God, even though it be presented to you under forms different from those of your own religion. Not only must you never imitate those who couple his name with vulgar oaths, but you must also accustom yourself not to pronounce the name of God lightly; you should even beware of mentioning it with familiarity.

¹ Paul Janet, *Petits éléments de morale*, pp. 118-119.

EXTRACTS FROM TEXT-BOOKS 245

Since God is the father of mankind you ought to feel the same love, gratitude, and respect for him that you feel for your parents.

All nations believe in the existence of God and in the immortality of the soul; but not all worship God in the same way. There are, as you know, different religions; those who profess them have a right to the respect of their creeds, just as it is their duty to respect those of others. We are all obliged to be tolerant.

Tolerance is written in our laws, but it is not observed as it should be, for it has not yet become an established custom. It is, however, more necessary than ever. It is a question of highest importance, of patriotic interest, that tolerance be more generally practised in France. We should understand that intolerance, by increasing internal divisions, is a cause of weakness in our country.

It is more especially in performing the duties of justice and of charity that you will fulfil your duties toward God. Be, therefore, just and kind, my child; practise conscientiously the virtues of justice and charity, devoting yourself, without other considerations, to the aid of your fellowmen; strive to become nobler by cultivating high ideals; love all that is right, all that is true, all that is just; finally, work cheerfully and courageously, for *to work is to pray*. In acting thus, you will be paying the highest honour to God.¹

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

God is the creator of the world and the father of mankind. It is he who rules over the immutable harmony of the spheres. It is he who has given man that intelligence from which he derives all his power and ability. Men have different conceptions of God, since

¹ O. Pavette, *La morale mise à la portée des enfants*, pp. 112-115.

246 FRANCE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

there are many religions. But all men recognise but one standard of morality, prescribed by conscience and founded upon human dignity.¹

DUTIES TOWARD GOD

God has wished man to be the most perfect being in all creation. He has given him an intelligence with which to acquire knowledge, a soul to love, and a conscience to guide him. For these benefits we owe him our love and gratitude. We will honour his name which we must never pronounce lightly, and we will follow the wise laws which his will dictates. In religion, as in all else, we will follow the advice of our parents until we are of age.²

DUTIES TOWARD GOD

It is thus seen that our actions are either deserving or undeserving.

The greater a man's merit from a moral point of view, the greater his virtue.

But in spite of his efforts, man cannot attain absolute perfection.

This absolute perfection in which we believe is God.

The existence of God is revealed to us in the splendours of the universe.

We fulfil our duties toward God when we practise virtue; let us strive continually to perfect ourselves in that which is good.

We have a sense of love, gratitude, and admiration for God. This may be called inner worship.

¹ Jules Bailly and Constant Dodey, *La morale pratique de l'écolier*, pp. 136-137.

² Jules Bailly and Constant Dodey, *La morale pratique de l'écolier*, pp. 138-139.

EXTRACTS FROM TEXT-BOOKS 247

The outward expression of worship varies with different religions, nations, traditions, and homes. All forms are to be respected.

Belief in God involves belief in a future life.¹

PROOFS OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Lift up your eyes, on a beautiful starry night, to the immensity of the heavens, and you will have for the first time an idea of a mysterious power. If, moreover, you are told that these stars which shine above you are infinitely larger worlds than our earth,—which is only a small planet,—and so distant that their light takes years to reach us; if it is explained to you that these worlds have courses regulated with an infallible precision, so that we may know in how many days those, which it has been possible for us to know best, accomplish their yearly revolutions upon their axis or around stars which are their centres; if you are shown that stellar movements, like eclipses, can be foreseen centuries in advance and that they take place at the instant foretold,—then the thought of a Creator, of a Supreme Ordainer, will force itself upon you with such might that your mind will seem almost overcome by it. You would not understand how a watch, or any machine whatsoever, could create itself and rule its own movements; all the more will you say to yourself that the universe must have an author, a regulator; a sacred name will come to your lips, and you will say, “The Creator and the Ordainer of all things is God.”²

¹ E. Cazes, *Instruction morale et civique*, pp. 117-118.

² *Education morale*, H. Baudrillart, quoted by Jules Bailly and Constant Dodey, *La morale pratique de l'écolier*, pp. 137-138.

MAN'S DUTIES TOWARD GOD

There is a name which has sustained, comforted, and strengthened thousands of generations of men; a name before which all men of all times have bowed. That name is God.

Can one believe that all these heavenly bodies which traverse the infinity of space without ever meeting have created themselves or are the work of chance?

Not only is God our Creator, not only is he the ordainer of the material world, but he is also the legislator of the moral universe; it is he who has imbued all human consciences with a sense of justice and charity.

God has created all that exists, and he himself was made by no one. He is eternal, omnipotent, just, good, and infinitely perfect.

He is the Supreme Being, the author of the world, and the father of all men.

The existence of God is revealed to us by:

The creation of the world; the order of the universe; Conscience.

The infinite power of God calls forth our adoration. We turn to him as children to their father: his mercy seems limitless to us and we seek it continually; his infinite goodness invites us to ask of him all the things we need. These aspirations of the soul toward the Creator are called prayer.

Worship is the practice of our duties toward God.

Worship may be internal or external, private or public.

All men have not the same conception of God; hence arise different religions, the Christian, the Jewish, the Moslem, etc. In a religion there may be several sects. Among Christians are Catholics, Protestants, and Schismatics. These differences and the intolerance of the age

EXTRACTS FROM TEXT-BOOKS 249

brought about the terrible civil wars of the sixteenth century.

No law has any right to determine the manner in which each one shall practise his own form of worship; for true faith is absolutely free, and, when it is sincere, no power in the world can destroy it

If we have the right to fulfil our duties toward the *Creator of the world* as we understand them, it is also our duty to respect the beliefs of others — to be tolerant. Religious persecution is an odious crime, since it assails that which is most sacred to man — his conscience.

Our duties toward God are:

(1) To love him as the father of all men; (2) to venerate him as the perfect being, the creator of the world; (3) never to pronounce his name lightly; (4) to practise all our duties.

To be just, to be good, is to love God.

To fulfil one's duty is again to love God and to render him homage.

All our duties without exception proceed from God.

We shall fulfil our duties much better if we consider them God's orders.

Consequently, the best way to venerate God is to perform our duties scrupulously. The moral law is the law of God.¹

DUTIES TOWARD GOD

Our duties toward God are:

To believe in God: that is to hold as a certainty that there is a God who has created us and placed us upon the earth, as he has created the earth on which we live and the world which surrounds us.

¹ Y. Curé and L. Houzelle, *Sommaires de leçons de morale*, pp. 172-174.

To trust God: that is to expect with firm confidence eternal blessings of his infinite goodness, and his grace to obtain them.

To love God: that is to devote our hearts to God as to our supreme good and our sovereign end. We must love God with all our hearts, with all our minds, and with all our strength. Those who place their supreme good elsewhere than in God, as do those ambitious of honours, the avaricious of riches, and the lovers of sensual pleasure, do not love God.

To worship him alone: that is to render unto him the worship and homage which we owe him as the Supreme Being and as our Creator.¹

THE UNIVERSE AND GOD

After the sun had disappeared below the horizon, first one star appeared, then another. The teacher mentioned their names.

"But what is there, sir, behind the stars and beyond that?" asked Paul.

"Other stars, and again other stars, and so on. It is the infinite, my friend. As far as you can imagine there is always something; the earth is but a point in space."

"But how is it that all these worlds which, as they say, are in motion, are never arrested nor disturbed in their course? Day and night, the seasons and the years always come regularly; they are regulated like a machine! One would almost think that some one is there to direct everything!"

"It is for this reason, my friend, that we acknowledge a God, that is to say, an invisible being whose wisdom must have devised that order which, without that, would seem inexplicable to you. As the universe is infinite, so also

¹ Georges Harmand, *Instruction morale et civique*, p. 36.

EXTRACTS FROM TEXT-BOOKS 251

must be the one who rules it. He cannot have weaknesses and defects like ours. Accordingly, we say that he is perfect. Think that it is his work which fills you with wonder when you behold nature, and that it is before him that you will bow in reverence when you are deeply moved, as you were a while ago, by the beauty of the world.”¹

¹ Léopold Mabilleau, *Cours de morale*, pp. 86, 87.

CHAPTER XIII

THE DISPERSION OF THE UNAUTHORISED RELIGIOUS ORDERS

WE have endeavoured to show that the Catholic Church of France has never had more earnestness in its priesthood, more culture and humanitarianism in its life, than now.¹ This can scarcely be said, however, of the regular clergy, *i. e.*, the members of monastic organisations, whose action has constantly generated national storms. In 1900 there were, in France, 1,663 orders of which 152 were for men and 1,511 for women. The total membership was 190,000,² an increase of 130,000 since the time preceding the French Revolution when already they were considered a national burden.³ An examination of the Concordat and of the Organic Articles leaves no doubt that the orders were altogether excluded.⁴

¹ See chapter IX.

² Waldeck-Rousseau, *Associations et congrégations*, p. iii.

³ See Taine H., *Les origines de la France contemporaine*, vol. I, p. 17, *et seq.*

⁴ Debidour A., *Histoire des rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat de 1789 à 1870*, p. 220. Père Du Lac admits that neither Napoleon

They first managed, however, by personal patronage, to secure authorisation for humble philanthropic work, and later on they slowly penetrated into the country which, as a whole, feared them. Their gradual return shows that it was not a part of the Concordat whose provisions were enforced at once. As we have already said, were the growth of the regular clergy to be taken as an index of religious progress one could not deny that the Republic has been more favourable to religion than preceding governments.¹

All orders have ascetic rules of greater or less rigidity, but most of them make an absolute surrender of self to their superior. In a discourse delivered in Paris, in 1868, upon "Monks and their Social Function," Père Didon waxes eloquent as he speaks of what the monastic gives up. He says: "You protest, perhaps. I shudder, myself. Well, yes. Personality itself shall be taken from me, like the rest, with my liberty; and after having repudiated all my be-

nor Pius VII referred to the orders, and that to have allowed them to return would have aroused the Republicans to revolt. There can be no better proofs than those stated by the celebrated Jesuit that the orders were not included in the Concordat. See Père Du Lac, *Jésuites*, p. 138 and *seq.*

¹ Père Du Lac admits that the Jesuits were able to establish 13 *collèges* during the Second Republic, and 10 under the present one, while under the Empire they founded only 3. *Op. cit.*, p. 210.

longings, having renounced chaste love, the vow of obedience which I take shall leave me only slavery. The monk is a slave, indeed, and it is his last name. I mistake, there is one more beautiful: the monk is less than a slave . . . he is a cadaver, *perinde ac cadaver*.”¹ By the side of this renunciation of the monk there is the omnipotence of his superior. One trembles at the thought of an imperfect use of such power. In 1872 Père Didon, without any warning or hearing, was ordered from Paris, where he was most popular, to Havre as a punishment.² In 1880, at the height of his popularity, he was summoned to Rome by his superior; and there and then, without any explanation, or chance to defend himself, he — one of the ablest orators of Europe — was sent in disgrace to a poor convent of Corsica.³ When his mother died calling for him, and calling to the last, he was refused permission to go to her. At last the superior yielded, but it was too late; for the great orator reached the old home three days after her death.⁴

As a rule orders are very zealous. One superb form of their service is that for the poor, the sick, the infirm, and the incurable. The

¹ Père Raynaud, *Le Père Didon*, p. 56.

² *Ibid.*, p. 109.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 204; *Lettres du Père Didon à un ami*, p. 28.

⁴ Didon, *Lettres*, p. 43.

“Little Sisters of the Poor” and others engaged in this ministry enjoy great popular respect and love. In a general way the heroic note is dominant in their lives. Their missions, in zeal, in consecration, in the variety of efforts, in the number of their martyrs, are nothing short of remarkable. Their missionaries have rendered signal services to French expansion,¹ but the government has more than liberally compensated them, and in some cases — in China, for instance — has sustained them in most unfair claims.² For generations it has been their protector in all lands, not to speak of subsidies. The public, however, has come to recognize that the Protectorate of Catholic missions is not infrequently detrimental to the good name of the country. When this is brought to the attention of missionaries they answer that they are in the foreign field to advance, not the interest of France, but that of religion. That is true, but, such being the case, they should not ask funds for a work which they do not do.

Many of the orders lay stress upon the work of education. Giving up that of charities, and in a measure that of missions, they have recog-

¹ Waldeck-Rousseau, *id.*, p. 300; G. Bonet-Maury, *Christianisme et civilisation*, pp. 1-86.

² Guyot Y., *Le Bilan social et politique de l'Eglise*, p. 307; J.-L. de Lanessan, *Les missions et leur protectorat*, pp. 23, 29, and 33.

nised that schools were the best avenues to the recovery of their former power. They opened schools of all kinds which, owing to their religious, social, and political influences, had success, — success of numbers, and success in securing diplomas which are granted on examination by the government. Many of these institutions, however, have been hothouses for candidates for diplomas. They were carried on by the unauthorised orders, which, wherever they have established themselves, have done their utmost to wreck the common schools. They have always caused Free-thinkers, Jews, and Protestants to appear as if they were traitors to the country, and guilty of heinous forms of evil. If the celebrated Dominican preacher, Père Montsabr  , eulogised the Inquisition at Notre Dame of Paris,¹ in the schools they virtually approved the Massacre of Saint Bartholemew's Day, the Inquisition, and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.² In one of their text-books Protestants, and not Catholics, were represented as the cause of this revocation. The French Revolution is never placed before their pupils except upon its most horrible side. There has always been an element of unfairness

¹ Loyson H., *Ni cl  ricaux, ni ath  s*, p. 140.

² Rambaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 110.

in dealing historically with those who opposed them, or in their competition with the State. They stealthily but surely laid their hands upon the teaching in forty-nine of the theological seminaries of the country.¹ Thus, tolerated at first, because of charitable work, they seized upon the education of laymen and finally upon that of the national clergy. This was a double violation of the Concordat, which contemplated no monastics, Gallican professors, Gallican pupils, Gallican doctrine.

They gradually extended their efforts in another direction. They consecrated a large part of their energy to revivalism; they held missions in the State churches, and succeeded in many instances in putting the secular, *i. e.*, the parish, priest in the background. These men in open revolt against the laws of the country took possession of national pulpits and, besides, opened chapels competing with the churches, often winning the aristocratic and the rich.² In Paris, by the side of seventy parish churches, they had five hundred and eleven chapels and churches;³ but few of these men were ready to go to help the poor, overburdened parish priest in desolate

¹ Trouillot, *Pour l'idée laïque*, p. 38.

² Narfon, *op. cit.*, p. 166; Waldeck-Rousseau, *op. cit.*, pp. 322 and 323.

³ Trouillot, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

mountainous districts. When it comes to pure disinterested motives, the people at large have more confidence in the quiet and humble manner of the parish priest than in the more spectacular acts of the monks.¹

The enterprises of the orders are quite various, and some of them are far from religious. There are those who have rendered themselves conspicuous as distillers and merchants. Their well-known liquors — *bénédictine*, *chartreuse*,² *rédemptorine*, and *trapistine* — do not suggest spiritual attainments. The Carthusians alone paid two million francs a year as excise taxes. They have many pious goods, and some which are not pious, to which they affix religious names — patent-medicines, for instance. Some have not hesitated to make promises for these drugs which outshine all the claims of our secular patent-medicine venders. Among all the orders there was an evident attempt almost everywhere to acquire property by all means. They have left the impression of unusual skill, not to say unscrupulousness, in avoiding the payment of taxes. There were

¹ A poor priest, going on duty in a third-class car, is reported to have said to a monk starting with a first-class ticket for a rich watering-place, "It is you that have made the vow of poverty, but it is I that practise it." Narfon, *op. cit.*, p. 349.

² In 1901 the amount of *Chartreuse* made is said to have been 1,600,000 litres. (Baedeker, *Sud-Est de la France*, p. 168.)

also circulated papers containing hints and methods to will property to monks and nuns in spite of the law.¹ By the side of their most beautiful work one witnesses the most shocking acts. Thus, those who have seen the labours of the Assumptionists in Saint Pierre and Miquelon, among deep-sea fishermen, could never withhold their admiration for their unlimited devotion to one of the most pitiable classes of Frenchmen, while they could not countenance for an instant the narrowness and fanaticism of the Assumptionists of France.² Their paper, *La Croix*, commenting upon three days of most disgraceful riots against the Jews in the capital of Algeria, said: "The Christ, indeed, reigned in Algiers during three days." Père Bailly, their superior, after the second condemnation of Dreyfus at Rennes, wrote in the same paper that this second verdict must be ascribed to the miraculous intervention of the Virgin.³

As a rule the orders have not that philosophical and scientific culture which confers upon self-surrender the highest value for social and religious beneficence. The attempt of Père Du Lac to show that the Jesuits have been, and

¹ Brisson, *Discours*.

² Narfon, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

³ Guyot, *Le Bilan*, etc., p. 165.

are still, friendly to science leads one to question whether that gentleman, as well as his fellow monks, has an adequate sense of what that word has come to mean in the modern world.¹ As a rule they do not conceal their unfriendliness to independent research, to free science, and to all the great sources of modern enlightenment, though they have among them erudite men, eminent scholars, and scientists of some repute. They cultivate mathematics and astronomy, safe sciences from their point of view; but they have no sympathy with the larger scientific ideal to understand all things and to probe all things.

The statement of Père Du Lac, that the rules of his order forbid its members political interference,² will convince no one. The monks have exercised such political action that Père Maumus, of Paris, endeavoured to bring them back to their true ministry when he said: "Our mission is not to cause deputies to be elected; we have to save souls and to spread the Kingdom of Jesus Christ." No one acquainted with human nature could expect to hear the praises of the Republic from their lips. Disparagement of the government is the most pronounced tendency of their life. It shows itself wherever we

¹ *Jésuites*, p. 260.

² *Ibid.*, p. 212.

can see them, hear them, or read their utterances. Everything is out of joint in the French democracy and, to please them, they should be allowed to set it right. They toil, they say, for a society founded not on the will of man, but of God, that is in reality, upon the will of the Pope, though at times they do not hesitate to disobey him.¹ Those men who claim to be Catholics, whose mission is to make the brotherhood of man a reality, are the narrowest of nationalists, and the most militant chauvinists. They are the mystic defenders of war and the greatest advocates of militarism. They were almost a unit against Dreyfus, and were largely responsible for the crusade of injustice against this unfortunate man.

The part which they played in that lamentable agitation revived the hatred for monastics, which had been more or less slumbering in the hearts of anti-clericals; and it gave to the people a new sense of national danger. In fact, monasticism and republicanism were bound to clash. The peaceful coexistence of two such powers in a democracy is a practical impossibility. In French eyes, monasticism is something sinister, hidden behind high walls, and waiting for the opportunity to crush anything

¹ Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 293.

that is liberal. At best it appears as the trust of religion controlled by the Roman pontiff. Monastic ideals and methods are the negation of equal opportunity. The growing ascendancy of the orders was viewed by almost all the respectable liberal political leaders — and they knew what they were about — as an imminent danger for freedom. A Catholic acquaintance of Professor Barrett Wendell said that “he had acquiesced with regret in the suppression of the teaching orders, for the reason that he could see no other means of saving France from the condition of Spain.”¹ Some of the most devout Catholics, even priests, shared this view. It was well remembered by the thoughtful, and proclaimed everywhere by politicians, that monasticism was the great rock in the way of corporate freedom. From the Franco-Prussian war to our own time, thirty-two bills had been presented to the French parliament, and defeated by the occult action of the orders. They did not wish to see non-Catholics enjoy the freedom which they themselves had.

One fact which, more than any other, aroused public opinion against the unauthorised orders, was their disregard of law. Their presence in the country was illegal, their property was ille-

¹ *The France of To-day*, p. 39.

gal; and, no matter how good they were in other respects, law-breakers could not be good elements of national life. This practice had been constant, even under the most Catholic governments, since the Concordat. The Jesuits never asked authorisation from any régime.¹ The pious Charles X compelled them to close their seven *collèges*. The king's order so to do was signed, not by a Free-thinker, but by the eloquent Bishop de Frayssinous.² In 1831 the Trappists were expelled by soldiers from their monastery of Melleray.³ In 1844 the Chamber of Deputies voted the expulsion of the Jesuits; but not one of them left France, even after the Holy See had advised the dissolution of the French Jesuitical communities.⁴

The orders would take advantage of the embarrassments of the government to penetrate everywhere into the country. It never was a "square deal." Napoleon III closed the Jesuit *collège* of Montaud in 1853, he opposed the opening of such institutions at Brest, and at Le Mans in 1860, and shut the doors of the institutions of Capuchins, of Hasbrouck, of the Redemptorists of Douai, Arras, and Boulogne

¹ Waldeck-Rousseau, *ibid.*, p. 354.

² Rambaud, *Histoire de la civilisation française contemporaine*, p. 354.

³ Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 211.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

in 1861.¹ During the same year, the Society of Saint Vincent of Paul preferred to disappear rather than to allow its organisation to be under government control.² Under Jules Ferry decrees were issued demanding the immediate dispersion of the Jesuits, and the government approval, or the dispersion of the unauthorised orders. These lent a deaf ear to government injunctions. There were no valid reasons for refusing to comply with the government's behest, except that they considered themselves above the laws of the country. Driven by force from their convents, the monks would return quietly. The thirty-nine orders, which were dispersed in and about Paris, had reassembled by 1888.³ They not only disregarded all civil authority, but were demoralising the authorised orders. From 1877 to 1900 the number of illegal nuns rose from 14,000 to 75,000, and the authorised decreased from 113,750 to 54,409.⁴

Popular anti-monasticism was intensified by the illegal co-operation of the most unpopular — in fact of almost all — bishops with the orders. They had been one in persecuting the most distinguished members of the university, Guizot, Cousin, Michelet, Quinet, Chalmel-Lacour,

¹ Rambaud, *ibid.*, p. 553.

² Waldeck-Rousseau, *ibid.*, p. 45.

³ Narfon, *ibid.*, 241.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

Jules Simon, Taine, Sarcey, Deschanel, and others; one in violating the Concordat which was a Gallican agreement; one in making abusive demands upon Napoleon III, and treating him shamefully when he did not do enough for the Vatican;¹ one in urging France to wage war upon Italy for the restoration of the temporal power; one in having MacMahon's men persecute non-Catholics; one in the Dreyfus crisis, during which they did not conceal their blind prejudice; one in their hostility to freedom of association. All this was only too well remembered, recited for the thousandth time by anti-clericals, who seemed to have been seized with *monasticophobia*. The most grotesque slander against a Jesuit or a Dominican was never too irrational for their belief. Some of them who had lost all faith still accepted the miracle of monastic perversity. The services rendered by the monks were forgotten, and all of them were swallowed up in one broad, sweeping condemnation. Their most violent critics were often their own former pupils.² It was a member of their Church who said: "Certain orders excel in making ob-

¹ Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 231.

² Chaigne L., *Les Catholiques français et leurs difficultés actuelles*, 1904, p. 195; Abbé Gayraud, *La République et la paix religieuse*, p. 234.

tuse and inert Catholics, and active and intelligent Free-masons.”¹ Waldeck-Rousseau, when Prime Minister, was impelled by the force of public opinion to refer the monastic question to parliament.

M. Georges Trouillot, a former Minister of the Colonies, and subsequently member of several cabinets, was made chairman of the parliamentary commission which investigated the whole matter. His report, filled with facts of all kinds upon the orders, presented a trustworthy and solid basis for action. The discourses of MM. Brisson, Bourgeois, and the Prime Minister added important data. Hitherto the public had listened to much prejudiced gossip, vague rumours had been circulated, but now unquestionable evidence was at hand. It was shown that 5,613 monastic establishments paid patents on account of their industrial and commercial pursuits,² 449 were devoted to ready-made clothing, 5 sold wine at wholesale, 6 liquor at wholesale, 4 at retail, 2 pure alcohol, 7 were makers of cordials, etc. In twenty years their property had risen from 700,000,000 to over 1,000,000,000 francs.³

It was further demonstrated that they had

¹ Chaigne, *Menus propos*, p. 57.

² Trouillot, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

³ Waldeck-Rousseau, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

been remarkably skilful in handling money, and in avoiding the payment of lawful taxes. M. Brisson read a judicial decision showing that a convent of Benedictines had declared to the revenue receiver that some buildings were worth 5,000 francs, while they were actually insured for 551,000 francs.¹ The same gentleman stated that one convent had so framed its rules that after her expulsion, a nun, who had brought in 2,000,000 francs, did not receive one farthing back.² He exposed the cruel treatment of girls at the institution of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd in Nancy, where poorly fed young women were subjected to painful labour; and this on the authority of a document written, not by anti-clericals, but by Bishop Turinaz of that city and endorsed by five archbishops and fifteen bishops.³

It was also shown at length that the orders had made a constant use of dummies, of fictitious societies, of sham mortgages, of pseudo-leases of estates to conceal the ownership of impor-

¹ Chamber of Deputies, Jan. 22, 1901.

² *Ibid.*

³ "After five, ten, fifteen, twenty, and even thirty years of that labour which enriches the nuns to such a point that they were able to spend in a few years more than 500,000 francs for buildings, a part of which were not really needed, these young girls, when they leave, receive neither money nor clothing — since I have complained, they receive insignificant sums without relation to their work." (Statement of Bishop Turinaz quoted by M. Brisson, Jan. 22, 1901.)

tant property.¹ In a matter of fact way, the chairman of the commission focussed the rays of his impeachment upon the orders as enemies of liberty. Some of the noblest sons of the Church could scarcely believe their ears when he read in parliament from the *Theologica dogmatica et moralis*, taught in sixty-seven theological seminaries, the following words: "The Church has received from God the power to force or repress those who wander from the truth, not only by spiritual penalties, but also by temporal ones. . . . These are prison, flagellation, torture, mutilation, death."²

Not to speak of the general problem of the unauthorised orders, could the French people allow such teaching in the seminaries and in the pulpits of the National Church? The anti-clericals, even the most moderate, were now of one mind. Their feelings were intensified when M. de Mun, with his usual eloquence and courage, opposed the Waldeck-Rousseau Bill, by virtue of "the sovereign right of the Church to reign over the State." He thinks that monks are the best representatives of the Church. Some of his friends pleaded in behalf of the unauthorised orders, because of their humanitarian

¹ Trouillot, *op. cit.*, pp. 140, 155; Brisson, *ibid.*

² *Pour l'idée laïque*, p. 52. The last edition of the work from which the words were quoted was of 1899.

service. A few claimed that the law, if passed, would be disastrous for French finances. We know what to think of that now. There were those who praised the Little Sisters of the Poor whom every one admires, and the Sisters of St. Vincent of Paul, who are close to the heart of the masses, when the question at issue was the illegal status of the Jesuits, the Carthusians, the Assumptionists, and others. As a whole the clericals made a poor defence of the unauthorised orders; they were prevented by their own precedents. The Republicans were doing what the Catholic governments had done all along, and were more liberal with the monks than Guizot, Villemain, the Duc de Broglie, and Thiers had been.¹

In this great parliamentary contention, so vital for Latin countries and so interesting for all, the point at issue was not religion. There is not one line in the discourses of M. Trouillot, or in those of the Prime Minister, which does not reflect the greatest respect for genuine religion. There is, however, a continuous jet of generous contempt for those who seemed to plead for religion, when, after all, they were striving for something else. Waldeck-Rousseau applied to them the indignant words of Victor

¹ Rambaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 110.

Hugo: "I do not confound you, clerical party, with the Church, any more than I confound the mistletoe with the oak; you are the parasites of the Church and her disease. Cease then to mix the Church with your affairs, your campaigns, your doctrines, and your ambitions. Do not call her your mother to make her your servant."¹

The increase of mortmain property is discussed, but not made central, in the debates. All along there stand out the numerous attempts of the orders to lay their hands upon the vital forces of the nation, and to place restraints upon modern freedom. It was clearly shown that the monastic conflict was a *Kulturkampf* for the triumph or defeat of modern civilisation, that all the most independent Catholic French kings had waged similar battles,² and that all Catholic States — Italy, Bavaria, and even Spain — had been forced to vote restrictive measures for monastic bodies. Some of their ablest defenders — M. Ribot, for instance — were quite opposed to monastic freedom. The bill became law.

This law was one of the most remarkable landmarks of progressive French legislation. It granted a new liberty to all French citizens, and

¹ *Associations et congrégations*, p. 327.

² Waldeck-Rousseau, *ibid*, pp. 89 and 218.

enabled them to band themselves together, or to form organisations for almost all possible purposes. The great movement of socialisation, which had given rise to a multitude of associations, had anticipated legislation. The legion of societies, representing an amazing progress in every direction, had been formed under a régime of toleration. Now the scientists, the artists, the merchants, the Free-thinkers, and the Protestants had a legal warrant for their corporate existence. Great organisations could now be formed which might, at times, counter-balance the great Catholic machinery. This is what the orders dreaded and the law sanctioned. It recognised absolute freedom to religious and secular associations, except, first in the case of mixed organisations of French citizens and foreigners, second in cases where the headquarters are in foreign countries, and third in the case of organisations whose members live in common. Even with this last class, the authorised orders are not to be disturbed in their chartered rights, though henceforth they will be kept close to them. They must confine themselves to the work for which they were approved. With them, as with the authorised monks, their religion remains untouched, they may continue to be priests, they may preach if they wish, they

may teach if they have adequate diplomas, they may do religiously whatever they like, except to be members of an unauthorised order. The government did not expel, but it dispersed these societies illegally constituted. Again it was not a question of religion, but of political preponderance and supremacy. The issue, indeed, was not religion, but "Who shall rule?" Ultramontane Catholicism or Republican France? Rome or Paris? The point upon which all liberals must be agreed is that by this law France made one of the greatest conquests in the history of her legislation.

When one views an order as a regular society, the Association Law seems illiberal and unfair. A closer attention to the nature of an ordinary organisation, and to that of a monastic institution, reveals how dissimilar they are, and consequently how differently they should be treated. One is for the benefit of each individual composing it, the other practically destroys the individual. He ceases to exist as such, and thereby loses all affinities for fruitful associations profitable to all. If a member of a society becomes dissatisfied, he may withdraw and take his share of capital and profits. In an order he is retained by all possible means; and if he retires, the sums he brought in are not re-

turned. In an ordinary society, capital is accumulated with the thought of future distributions to its members; in a monastic institution there is mortmain property which goes on accumulating more and more until it may, in many cases it has, become a social danger. A member of a society remains a member of his family; in an order there is a complete severance of all family ties. The member of an ordinary organisation is a free, vital part of society, contributing to its reproduction; the member of an order, by his vows, is cut off from such functions. The 200,000 members of the orders—good men and good women—are a stupendous force of elimination of the fittest and best elements of the population. The member of an ordinary society is a free citizen; but that of an order violates the most fundamental moral and political law, that no human being has a right to make an absolute surrender of himself or of his liberty to one being, his monastic superior or any one else. In an ordinary society the member accepts the laws of the State; a member of an order is under the absolute sway of his superior, often a foreigner, and in any case he must be an obedient subject of a foreigner—the Pope. Ordinary societies co-ordinate themselves easily with the life and the

laws of the State, while the orders develop a kind of state within the State. To allow the development of these unauthorised orders, for the present at least, would have been suicidal. At all events they were contrary to the stipulations of the Concordat and of the Organic Articles still in force.

Waldeck-Rousseau did not belong to the school of academic liberty which remains in the realm of abstractions; he had a clear sense of political necessities, but he endeavoured to be fair. In the settlement of the illegally acquired property of the unauthorised orders, he did not exaggerate when he said that he had chosen "the best, the justest, and the most humane method."¹ He might have acted upon the narrow, though strictly judicial principle, that all property which has no legal owner belongs to the State.² In so doing he would have followed the example of one of the popes,³ who confiscated all the belongings of the Jesuits. He might also have done as Louis XIV, who seized all property acquired contrary to his edicts.⁴ He chose a different course. The law allows the members of the dispersed orders to recover the property brought by them into the congregation

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 270.

² Trouillot, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 273.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

to which they belonged. It permits donors and their heirs to claim gifts made to the monastic institutions. It decides that some of this property shall be used for the relief of the needy members,¹ and requires that the charities intended for the poor, the invalid, and the incurable shall be continued to them in legal institutions, preferably in those of the Church or in those of the State.² Not one penny of this property was confiscated on behalf of the Treasury.

Militant Catholics in France — they represent only a noisy minority — have always been the worst enemies of the Church. By their intolerance they have made the celebrity of their antagonists. Some men have secured renown by the halo of hatred which these clericals have put round their head. They did much for Renan and for Littré. Lately, in Paris, they brought into prominence a young professor of the name of Thalinas who was pursued by them for statements about Joan of Arc, which he never uttered. They so abused Waldeck-Rousseau that he withdrew from his leadership and was replaced by M. Combes. Brought up in the Church, later on a cleric, and subsequently a

¹ A decree signed by M. Briand provides a home for the aged dispersed monks, in their own buildings if these have not been sold, or in some other place. (*Le Siècle*, July 12, 1909.)

² *Loi relative au contrat d'association*, titre III, art. 18.

professor of theology, the new leader had left the Church of his birth, and then became its violent antagonist. He had the anti-clericalism of Waldeck-Rousseau, but not his sense of measure and of fairness. Seeing the state of public opinion, he sided with the ultra-radicals, the Socialists, and led the parliament to pass a law preventing the orders from teaching — a law to be enforced gradually in the course of the next ten years. Certainly there was much to say, and much to do, when the question came up of not allowing the illegal orders, in revolt against the laws of the land, to educate the children; but that was not the case with the authorised orders, which, equally with the unauthorised, M. Combes's legislation prohibited from teaching. Furthermore, he proceeded to enforce the Law of Association in a spirit different from that in which it was voted. The matter of property had been largely attended to by the monks and the nuns themselves. What was left could not be bought by Catholics except under the penalty of excommunication. Hence, in Catholic districts, the inability of the government to get hold of the property, or sell it at its real value.

The work of scattering the organisations condemned was done with tact and firmness. The officials were always considerate — the writer

saw them more than once at work — but the law had to be enforced. In some of the most ignorant parts of the country, the clericals so stirred up the masses, and misrepresented the law, that peasants assumed a very hostile, and at times belligerent, attitude. Some of the leaders would not have shrunk from shedding blood. In some cases public officers, going to convents, were cruelly beaten or drenched with unnamable liquids. They were so grossly abused that national sympathies, regardless of the merits of the case, even, were with the representatives of the law. After closing 500 monastic institutions and 12,000 schools, and scattering 40,000 monks, friars, and nuns, M. Combes secured a great electoral victory and approval. The national endorsement must not only be counted, but weighed. Had it been signed, we should have read not only, as a matter of course, the names of the professional agitators of anti-clericalism who are like all professional agitators, but also the names of men friendly to modern science, to modern culture, to sound ideas of justice; and a multitude of these names would have been those of earnest Catholics, and some of them, even, those of noble liberal Catholic priests.

The Law of Association, as a legal recogni-

tion of the rights of free citizens to combine, is so far a work above praise, but it is not a solution of the monastic question. It is, at best, the elimination of the most turbulent orders. There are probably yet in France 150,000 monastics who continue most of their former work. In a large measure the future is in their hands. If they wish to continue the struggle, they will have great national corporations against them. Free-masonry, the Federation of Labour, and other strong bodies will fight them. The time is no longer when the Church was the only great organisation by the side of the State. The orders must realise that, whatever be the violent elements antagonistic to them, the most intelligent and liberty-loving citizens dread them, and often hate them. The good monks, disliked even by many of their former pupils, must cease to pose as if they were hated because of their goodness. They must no longer represent their opponents as the embodiment of evil, for fair-minded men know that not to be true. Let the monastics lay aside calumny as a tool, put a little sweetness into their relations with their opponents, and accept principles of political equity without any mental reservation. Anti-clericalism has had an easy victory, because it had a good case. France could not

stand the Hispano-monastic régime, still flourishing beyond the Pyrenees. The orders must modernise their ideals and do their work by the side of the sons of Free-thought, the sons of Israel, or of Protestant communions on the basis of common rights, of a common sincerity, of a common earnestness and solidarity. Then, and only then, will the monastic problem have received a practical and lasting solution.

CHAPTER XIV

THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

THE anti-clericals represent all those who have broken all bonds of external sympathy with the militant clergy. The majority of them are quiet, modest theists, largely driven out of the Church by the political interferences of the priests. Some have still the traits of the old Voltairians. Others resemble the materialists of the eighteenth century, though they give themselves out as Positivists. There are those of an extreme temperament who pose as the custodians of reason, the defenders of science, and the representatives of progress; but this means, in most cases, that they are religiously indifferent, irreligious, or agnostic. Some Free-masons among them are as intolerant as the orders themselves. Scientists are mostly anti-clericals, though moderate as a rule. The teachers, a noble body of men and women, are the greatest force of resistance against the

efforts of sacerdotalism. The unscrupulous attacks of the clergy against the machinery of State education have made them bitterly hostile and not infrequently irreligious. They describe the priests as "formidable and tenebrous," as "deceiving the masses," and in kindred terms. Were the manufacturers, the business men, and the farmers divided into two classes, the larger one would be found with the opponents of the clergy. The Socialists are a unit in their anti-clericalism.

In the Chamber of Deputies, Buisson, de Pressensé, Jaurès, Bourgeois, Brisson, Doumer, Delcassé, Trouillot, Millerand, and Briand constitute an anti-clerical group which, in ability, statesmanship, and character, cannot be equalled by the twenty-five barons, dukes, and counts of the other side, even including worthy men like Count de Mun and Baron Denys Cochin. The same is true in the Senate. Anti-clericals have with them the best educated and the most advanced sections of the country. Abbé Gayraud admits that "anti-clerical ideas have invaded the electoral body and that they control it. How small indeed is the number of the citizens who, in their public life, in the exercise of popular sovereignty, act like true Catholics, that is, care for the interests of religion and the needs

of the Church! The reason for this is that the mass of electors have of Catholicism only baptism, the first communion, the formalities of marriage, and a few practices imposed by customs and by social conventions.”¹

Such being the case, how dared the clergy speak of “Catholic France,” and demand State money to further their cause? Anti-clericals were not only aware of this injustice, but viewed the State Church as a source of constant perturbation, as a body ever with fresh grievances which, with the best intentions in the world on the part of the government, could never be satisfied. Thus, at the beginning of 1873, they were bitter in their criticisms because the officers of a man-of-war stationed at Cività Vecchia made a New Year’s call upon the King of Italy in Rome.² A month later, they were furious against M. Fournier, ambassador to the Quirinal, because he had spoken kindly of the King, and received openly well known non-Catholic Frenchmen.³ To please the clericals the government kept a man-of-war at the disposal of the Pope at Cività Vecchia⁴ — a fact which greatly incensed Italian patriots, and rightly too. It is easy to understand the intensity of restless-

¹ *La République et la paix religieuse*, p. 43.

² *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Jan. 1, 1873, p. 219.

³ *Ibid.*, Feb. 1, 1873.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Jan. 15, 1873, p. 463.

ness, of impatience, and of antagonism stirred up in the hearts of anti-clericals by such proceedings.

It must be borne in mind that, when the Separation came, in 1905, a great change had taken place in French politics as compared with the early days of the Republic. The anti-clericals are now where the clericals were then. These, as soon as they could, under MacMahon, placed bishops in the superior council of education; they put priests, *ex-officio*, on the boards of charities; they expropriated Parisian citizens to build that most unpopular church—the Sacred Heart of Montmartre; secured a very expensive system of chaplains for the army; accorded to Catholic higher institutions of learning the privilege of granting degrees; authorised thirty-six religious orders; raised the Catholic budget of worship, which was two million francs in 1801, to fifty-four millions.¹ There was no limit to their Tammany-like grasping propensities.

At this time every public official from the president of the Republic to the least village constable was under their thumb. They did their utmost to restore the old monarchical régime, to regain every privilege lost by, and since, the French Revolution. Every public official had

¹ Narfon, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

to be as zealous in the cause advocated by the Church as a sycophant in the interest of his patron. The bishops used all their influence with the Minister of Education against liberal professors, did their utmost to have them dismissed from their chairs, or attacked them branding them as "public poisoners." In the common schools the Catholic catechism was the prominent book, and woe to the teacher who did not display religious zeal! Most severe measures were voted against any association which "would tend toward the abolition of religion," whereby was meant any opposition to Catholicism. Free-thinkers laboured under great disabilities. In some places their funerals were not allowed in daytime. An old law preventing priests who had left the Church from marrying was strictly enforced. The great pulpit orator, Father Hyacinth, was not permitted even to preach in Paris.

Protestants, Jews, and Free-thinkers in the army, on some occasions, were compelled to attend the Catholic Church and to kneel before the altar at the command of their officers. Protestants, entitled by law to an honourable burial, were relegated to the corner of the cemetery reserved for those who had committed suicide. Protestant chapels were closed under

the pretext that speakers had attacked the Catholic Church. The writer knew a Protestant missionary who was taken to the court of Draguignan, then to that of Aix, and finally to that of Nîmes, by a Catholic attorney bent on his condemnation for holding Protestant services. The circulation of Protestant books was hindered in a most vexatious manner. The majority of the parliament, which was Catholic, refused to vote a law of religious liberty for all. Bishop Dupanloup, who opposed it, said that such a law would be subversive. They were apparently on the side of liberty only when they opposed the bill on compulsory education. All along they acted in perfect defiance of the national will. By their intolerance and grasping spirit they aroused the intelligence, the conscience, and the patriotism of the nation against them. At the following elections, February 22, 1876, popular indignation inflicted upon them a political Waterloo, from which they have not as yet recovered.

The Republicans had hitherto taken merely a defensive stand; now they assumed the offensive. A most active campaign was open against the orders and their friends. Gambetta voiced national feelings when he exclaimed, "Clericalism is the enemy," and indicated the way for

liberation. Most of the privileges clutched under MacMahon were nullified. The State-right to grant degrees, recently extended to Catholic institutions, was repealed.¹ In 1880 the high clergy and magistrates were excluded from the superior council of public instruction. Jules Ferry took steps which eventually resulted in the expulsion of the Jesuits. The mortmain property of the orders, which, by its very nature, paid no inheritance tax, was forced by law to pay sufficiently to make taxation alike for property held by a monk or a layman. The friars and nuns, who had hitherto been allowed to teach without diplomas while common school teachers were not, were subjected to the same requirement. The teaching of the Roman Catholic catechism in the common schools was replaced by that of Morals. Non-Catholic patients had been so treated by some of the nuns in the hospitals that nurses took their places. Six faculties of Catholic theology were closed. As a matter of fact, the bishops, and not the anti-clericals, gave the death-blow to these institutions, but their extinction was considered

¹ The degrees are not, as in America, granted by any one school, but by the government. They are not only the recognition of certain attainments, but also of a virtual claim by the holder to State positions. This privilege of granting degrees cannot be too strictly guarded against the encroachments of sects or parties.

another victory for the opponents of Rome. Catholic and Protestant theological students were drafted for military service, though for a shorter time than were other citizens. Religious processions in the streets were prohibited in communities where a large part of the public were opposed to them. Crucifixes over the entrances of cemeteries, in the schools or in the court houses, were ordered to be removed.

There was hardly one of these reforms which the American public would not have approved, because they were all in favour of impartial law; and yet all were resisted by the clerical party as sacrilegious assaults upon Church rights. Instead of disarming Republicans by reasonable concessions, they aroused them still more. The harshness of the clericals and the fanaticism of the clergy — only five priests formed an exception¹ — during the Dreyfus trial, and the violence of the monks called attention to the danger of monasticism.² Waldeck-Rousseau, pressed by public opinion, secured the Law of Association from the parliament. M. Combes, carried along by the same movement, incited the parliament to vote the exclusion of the orders from teaching. The clergy of France had en-

¹ Guyot, *Le Bilan*, etc., p. 102.

² Narfon, *Vers l'Eglise libre*, p. 292.

joyed for over one hundred years the lucrative monopoly of burials. They were virtual undertakers, and received sixty per cent of the profits, even when the funerals were those of Free-thinkers, not attended with religious rites or forms of any kind.¹ This monopoly was taken from them in 1904.

Though victorious all along the line in this battle of secularisation, anti-clericals were tired of this ever-renewed conflict. They were ready, like unflinching surgeons, to apply the knife to the bonds uniting Church and State. They had, in fact, already made some advance in that direction, when the Vatican offered them a signal opportunity so to do.

The Vatican had so signally failed to meet the obligations of the Concordat that any attempt to justify its course before intelligent public opinion would have been frail and vain. The Gallican provisions of that agreement, which limited to a large extent the authority of the Pope over the French Church, had been disregarded, and the Ultramontane régime, which makes the Pope supreme, had been gradually established. Catholics may discuss among themselves the relative merits of the two ecclesiastical systems, but the fact is indisputable that

¹ Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 119.

Gallicanism was contemplated in the Concordat. There has also been a peculiar unscrupulousness in bringing about the transformation. In the case of a vacant bishopric the French government had the right to nominate an incumbent, who then received a bull of investiture from the Holy See. Without declaring the fact, the officials of the Vatican inserted in the bull of investiture the Latin word *nobis* which changed the whole character of the Franco-Papal relations. By writing the bull as it had been for nearly a century, it was the President of the Republic that made the appointment, with the insertion of *nobis* it was the Pope.¹ When this clever ruse was discovered, the Quay d'Orsay declined to accept the papal letters. After long and painful discussions the Pope was forced to surrender his inglorious *nobis*.

This incident was no sooner settled than another came up. Among the recent events most popular in France was the reconciliation with Italy. The loud demonstrations of loyalty toward the Vatican on the part of clericals were generally followed by louder expressions of sympathy with the Quirinal on the part of French Liberals. They rejoiced when the King

¹ Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 300; Debidour, *Histoire des rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat en France de 1789 à 1890*, vol. I, p. 83; vol. II, pp. 362, 389.

of Italy visited Paris, and when, later, M. Loubet went to Rome. This was the time which Pius X chose to send a letter of protest. The attitude of French Catholics had forced Italy into the Triple Alliance, to the detriment, many Italians believed, of their own country. Rome, the unendurable storm centre of the political life of France at home, was also a force of disturbance abroad.

Close upon this a new incident was to have more serious consequences. The hostility of the bishops against the government was not without exceptions. Several of the eighty-four prelates of the country, who had refused to join the others in their loud protests against the secularising tendencies of the government, created a great commotion. Their moderation seemed to cast reflection upon the course of their peers. This rendered the former popular with the Republicans, while it had the contrary effect upon the clericals. The whole body of Ultramontanes was against them. In two dioceses a regular boycott was organised against the bishops. Their antagonists did not shrink from making, right or wrong, the most serious charges against them in Rome. They were summoned thither to justify themselves; but when they failed to go, threatening letters were sent and a virtual deposition of

the bishops took place.¹ This step, no doubt permissible from the point of view of ecclesiastical discipline, was contrary to the terms of the Concordat; for if the Pope cannot nominate a bishop, he cannot depose one without prior understanding with the government. M. Delcassé and his colleagues felt that the action of the Vatican had been determined much more by the moderation and the liberalism of the bishops than by their moral or ecclesiastical deviations. When he failed to obtain immediate satisfaction from Cardinal Merry del Val, the strained relations were broken. The French embassy to the Vatican was closed, and the nuncio in Paris was informed that his diplomatic functions had ceased. This was the end of the Napoleonic Concordat.

The principle of separation of Church and State had been already defended by isolated Catholics. In 1872 the majority of French Protestant consistories were in favour of it, and their National Synod gave it much attention.² It had also been much discussed in parliament. From 1877 onwards the annual vote of ecclesiastical appropriations was the occasion of yearly discussions. In 1881 a proposition was made

¹ Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 312.

² Bersier, *Histoire du synode général*, vol. II, pp. 3, 338, 339, and 341.

to the Chamber of Deputies to abrogate the Concordat.¹ In 1896 the proposal received 152 votes. In 1902 several proposals were made, sustained by 191 votes; and in 1904 the Separatists mustered 232 votes.² Independently of the events in Rome, public opinion was moving rapidly; MM. de Pressensé, Hubbard, Florens, Réveillaud, and Grosjean with Berthoulat had presented projects of separation before the Chamber of Deputies in 1903. Deputy Sénac proposed a similar law in 1904, which was followed by the final Bill of Separation in 1905.

The disruption was "inevitable," says M. Chaigne.³ It was no new issue, though the acts of the Vatican had hastened its realisation. The clericals resorted to all kinds of manœuvres to secure its postponement, but even the overthrow of M. Combes did not help them. Those who had considered the separation impossible⁴ now changed their mind. The debates reached a high degree of elevation. The bill was discussed brilliantly and eloquently during forty-eight daily or nightly sessions. Both sides had a profound sense of the vastness of the issues of the law. Both displayed uncommon powers

¹ Réveillaud, *La Séparation des églises et de l'état*, p. 134.

² Narfon, *ibid.*, p. xxvii.

³ Chaigne, *Menus propos*, etc., p. 100.

⁴ Gayraud, *op. cit.*, p. 71; Réveillaud, *op. cit.*, pp. 186, 304.

in the defence of their respective positions. Though feelings were intense, the discussions remained within the domain of parliamentary courtesy. On July 4th, 1905, the bill was passed by 341 votes against 233, and when on December 6th, it was also voted by the Senate with a large majority it became law. We must examine its tenor.

The first article marks a new era in the history of religious freedom. When, under the presidency of MacMahon, Dr. de Pressensé proposed a law sanctioning freedom of conscience, the bill was treated almost contemptuously. The clergy were indignant at the daring of the Protestant senator. This law begins with the following words: "The Republic guarantees freedom of conscience." Then it asserts that the French government neither knows, salaries, nor subsidises any religious body, exception being made in the case of chaplains in the colleges, hospitals, asylums, and prisons. The movable and immovable property of the State churches, the edifices excepted, are transferred to the religious associations who will have the care of the churches. Reasonable provisions are made for the present debts of some of the churches. All endowments for general charities go to the regular State charity organisations. In cases

in which there are no religious associations, the property is devoted to the charities of the district. In all the transfers of property the State will not levy the usual tax. Clergymen over sixty years of age, and with over thirty years of ministry, receive three-quarters of their salary; those forty-five years old, with twenty years of service, are entitled to one-half. The clergymen in office, not belonging to either of the preceding classes, will receive full salary the first year, two-thirds of it during the second, one-half the third, and one-third the fourth year. In villages of less than 1,000 inhabitants all these periods are doubled. Professors in the Protestant schools of theology have considerate treatment. The cathedrals, churches, chapels, Protestant houses of worship, and synagogues remain the property of the State, but they continue to be used without compensation by the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish associations. The archbishops and bishops may continue to use the State palaces for two years. The clergy may continue to dwell in their manses; the theological seminaries and the Protestant faculties of theology may remain in their present buildings for five years. Provisions have been made for the preservation of objects and buildings which present a peculiar historical or ar-

tistic interest. The archives and libraries having documents and charters belonging to the State will surrender them to the institutions to which they properly belong. In the case of the sale of any object connected with religious buildings the churches will have a right to pre-emption. The religious associations must manage their affairs in a business-like way. They must publish annual financial reports. The local religious associations may group themselves into unions. The church buildings remaining State property are free from taxes, the others are subject to the general law. Any church of any denomination may be opened by a simple declaration to the authorities.

It was to be expected that provisions would be made against possible abuses on the part of the Church. Political meetings in the churches are forbidden. Public processions and the ringing of the bells are left to the mayors. As municipal councils are elected by the people, and the mayors by the municipal council, the citizens will decide. Religious emblems are not allowed upon public monuments or public squares, but may be placed upon religious buildings, in cemeteries, in museums, and expositions. Religious instruction cannot be given to children of the common schools during school hours.

Threats to cause a child to be discharged, or any other threat on account of religion, will be severely punished. A heavy penalty will be inflicted upon those who may disturb or interrupt any religious service. Outrage or defamation of a public official from the pulpit will be severely repressed. Encouragement to resist the law of the country or to excite citizens against each other, followed by effects, make a preacher liable to two years' imprisonment. Theological students are required to do only one year of military service instead of two like other citizens, and in case of war are to serve in the infirmary corps. The Concordat is abrogated.¹

Protesting against the law, Pope Pius X, speaking as one "holding the place of Christ," says: "We condemn and reprove it as insulting to God, as contrary to the divine constitution of the Church, as favouring schisms, as hostile to our authority and to that of rightful pastors, as confiscating the property of the Church, as opposed to common law, as hostile to the Apostolic See and to ourselves etc."² Archbishop Sonnois of Cambray is even more violent. In a pastoral

¹ It should be remembered that the expression, "the Concordat," is misleading. Other concordats had preceded it; that of 1472 between Sixtus IV and Louis XI, and that of 1516 between Leo X and Francis I. These concordats were not, any more than the Napoleonic one, abrogated by common consent.

² *Vehementer nos*, etc.

letter issued to his diocese, he places large headings over paragraphs, pretending to give the purport of the law: "No More God," "No More Budget of Worship," "No More Churches," "No More Crosses," "No More Calvaries," "No More Images of the Holy Virgin Mary," "No More Religion," and concludes by appealing to the faithful in the same large type: "Catholics, is this what you wish?"¹ Such violent and unfair utterances, intended to arouse the people, produced the contrary effect.

What are the facts? A distinguished Catholic, and an untiring opponent of the Radicals, M. J. de Narfon, stated that the law was more liberal than Catholics could have expected.² A group of eminent Catholics, ironically called "Green Cardinals," because almost all belonged to one or another of the five great academies, whose official color is green, sent a petition to the Pope begging him to accept the law. They speak of its benefits as follows: "The most considerable of these advantages is assuredly the liberty of ecclesiastical nominations. But there are others: the free and indefinite surrender of the places of worship, the temporary enjoyment—which may be extended—of the episcopal palaces, of the rectories and of

¹ *L'Univers*, Jan. 7, 1906.

² *Vers l'Eglise libre*, p. xix.

the seminaries, the privileges left to cultural associations to administer, under mere nominal control, two hundred millions' worth of property which constitutes the present patrimony of the churches of France, and, finally, the pensions and grants which, though limited, assure for the immediate present, the daily bread of our priests. Never will any one succeed in making the people believe that a law which stipulates such advantages on behalf of the Church is a law absolutely hostile to religion."¹ The honest purpose of the law was to put an end to an intolerable situation. This law cannot have been so deficient, after all, inasmuch as fifty-six French prelates voted in favour of submitting to it and only eighteen were against such a course.² They even went so far as to formulate rules for the new order of things.

Protestants and Hebrews have accepted it with the sense that it was, as a whole, the best possible in the circumstances. The Catholics

¹ *Supplique d'un groupe de catholiques français au Pape Pie X*, p. 13. These Catholics were: Prince d'Arenberg, J. C. Ancoc, F. Brunetière, Comte de Caraman, L. de Castelnau, Denis Cochin, Léon Devin, A. Gigot, Georges Goyau, Comte d'Haussonville, H. de Lacombe, de Lapparent, A. Leroy-Beaulieu, G. Picot, H. Lorin, Ed. Rousse, Sabatier, R. Saleilles, Marquis de Ségur, E. Sénart, P. Thureau-Dangin, A. Vandal, Marquis de Vogüe. Montagnini, *Les Fiches pontificales*, p. 181. It would be difficult to find a nobler or more distinguished group of Catholics in any city of the world.

² Chaigne, *Menus propos*, p. 96.

have complained of the strict legislation against them, but it had been made necessary by their past as well as by their more recent history. Was there anything unreasonable in preventing the clergy, who had fomented so many internal dissensions, from making the churches political centres? In view of the violent attacks of the clergy against the men of the government, was it unwise to forbid pulpit abuse of public officials? In America clergymen may do as they like, because they are in their own buildings erected with their own funds; but in France churches — most of them at least — belong to the State. Was it unfair to prohibit threats against any one on account of his or of her religion? Was it “tyrannical” to forbid priests from inciting citizens against each other? In view of the fact that the management of the finances of the churches had been scandalously shocking and abusive in former days, was it unjust for the law to require regular accounting? Should a religious corporation be allowed practices which we would not tolerate for an instant in an insurance society? If those concerning whom these laws were made do what they ought, the laws will not affect them; but if they wish to resist the national will, they will show the wisdom of this legislation.

The strongest objection of the Vatican was made to that feature of the Law of Separation which organised church boards, *associations cultuelles*. In its provisions the government gave the fullest possible autonomy to Catholic bodies. They themselves were free to elect their trustees as they liked. They could make them of men, of women, even of clergymen, or of all combined. These trustees could not be good Catholics unless they were in proper relations to their bishops.¹ As this election was absolutely in their hands, they could but be satisfactory. The doctrinal tests were entirely in their keeping. There the government could not interfere. Once elected, the trustees would have committed to them the buildings and the endowments, but nothing more. At this point the government claimed the right to see that the sums left for the saying of masses for the dead were spent according to the purpose of the giver, and that the legacies for the training of men for the priesthood or for missions were used as originally intended. In that respect it required from them, without any humiliation or oppression, what it requires from neutral societies, that is, nothing but a "square deal." The Pope objected that this was contrary "to the divine

¹ Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 330.

government of the Church." To this his opponents answered that the parliament was not a theological organisation, that it was bound to ignore everything about the "divine government," and that parliamentary action was limited to human relationship — that the proposed boards of trustees were far more liberal than similar Catholic organisations in Prussia, condemned by the bishops of the country, but accepted over their head by the Pope — that the Church which had acquiesced in the Concordat could accept anything, and that, finally, the great grievance of Pius X was that he could not control the ecclesiastical wealth of France, and thereby have a material hold over all the French clergy, and that for all time.

The accusation, that the Republic has violated pledges, made at the time of the Concordat, by which the State would pay the salary of the clergy as a compensation for the loss of property at the time of the Revolution, is absolutely untenable. There is no reference to such an agreement in the Concordat or in the Organic Articles. Furthermore, there has never been any record of such obligations in dealing with the national debt. Again, if there had been such a recognition, the amount of indemnity would have been fixed in a tangible manner.

Such an indebtedness would have been determined accurately, and its instalments paid regularly upon a definite basis; but we find the government paying 2,000,000 francs in 1801, and 54,000,000 under MacMahon.¹ Here is an increase of twenty-six fold. Such a huge increment cannot be understood if the 54,000,000 francs pay the same debt in 1876 as the 2,000,000 paid at the time of the Concordat, while the increase is perfectly intelligible on the basis that clergymen were paid for public service. In Napoleon's eyes, they were State officials.

The charges of confiscation of property, as a whole, are untrue. There never was a "property of the Church" under the *ancien régime*, but properties of parishes, properties of convents, and properties of other institutions. Without discussing this point, it suffices to say that under a Catholic king, Louis XVI, the National Assembly, in which there were three hundred and eleven priests,² made over to the State, in 1789, all ecclesiastical wealth, much of which had been the object of scandalous uses by the higher members of the clergy. The churches were so completely considered State property that the government used them not infrequently for secular purposes. Napoleon transferred several of them

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 270.

² *Moniteur universel*, 1789, p. 236.

to Protestants, whose own buildings had been given to the Church, confiscated, or destroyed during the seventeenth century. It is on that account that the *Oratoire* became the great centre of Protestant worship in Paris, and that the only *Eglise Sainte Marie*, in that city, is a Protestant church. The churches so obviously belonged to the State that when a Catholic parish became Protestant, the church was at once transferred by the authorities to Protestants for their worship.¹ At the death of Victor Hugo the Panthéon was secularised by virtue of the same principle. All the property used by Catholics was kept up, sometimes enlarged and beautified, with taxes levied upon every one, Free-thinkers, Jews, and Protestants as well as Catholics, and that for over a century. There have been cases in which there was something bordering upon confiscation, but that was only exceptional. Several churches erected with Catholic funds should have been restored to them absolutely; but even here, if we take the case of the Church of the Sacred Heart of Paris, though the money came from the faithful, the land was secured while the clericals were in power by a wholesale expropriation at Montmartre. Comte d'Haussonville, a distinguished

¹ Delapierre E., *Napoléon Roussel*, p. 128

Catholic, has shown¹ that upon this matter the law was liberal, that it was a virtual recognition of independent ecclesiastical property, to be administered by trustees elected by Catholics in their own way. The honest purpose of the parliament was that Catholics should have the undisputed use of this property so long as there are French Catholics.

Another objection of the Church authorities was of a judicial nature. They raised the question, "Who in the matter of contestations will decide upon conflicting claims?" Were two Catholic associations to petition for the possession of the same property, who would judge in last resort? The writer will go as far as he who goes the furthest in his admiration for clergymen at large. He is ready to concede to French priests great merits of all kinds—zeal, earnestness, and unselfishness. France has never had a better clergy, better educated, better trained, and morally better than now, but it is a clergy incapable of impartial decisions. They wish to be judges in questions in which they are one of the parties. Thus in Culey (Meuse), the bishop dismissed the Abbé Hutin while his parishioners wished to keep him. As soon as the churches preparing for *associations cultuelles* began their

¹ *Après la Séparation*, p. 22.

work, one hundred and thirty members of the Church were for the priest, and about fifteen — some even questionable members — were for the bishop. Now had this been referred to an ecclesiastical tribunal, it would have been decided on behalf of the bishop, and yet morally the property belonged to that overwhelming majority whose fathers had built the church, and who had themselves kept it in repair.¹ The Protestants raised no such objection. They had two associations claiming the same chapel, but in a few hours it was satisfactorily settled by arbitration. The French government made provisions to submit such cases to the *Conseil d'Etat*, which would decide in equity somewhat as the British Royal Commission has done with the wealth of the Free Church of Scotland. Again, the statements widely circulated that the courts of France were filled with the “creatures” of the government, as judges, counts for very little among those who have seen how frequently the French Bench has rendered — and still renders — verdicts against the men in power. Recent decisions in reference to ecclesiastical rights to the use of buildings for worship, have almost all been favourable to the Church.

¹ Lhermite and Maria Vérone, *La Séparation et ses conséquences*, p. 85.

The great impeachment, that Republicans have endeavoured to destroy religion, has already been answered in the chapter on "Moral Instruction in French Schools." Abbé Gayraud says that the neutrality of the school is contrary to the Christian faith.¹ That priests are hostile to any independent programme of moral teaching not their own, is well known. They will not be satisfied with any neutral one; they will not accept that of others who believe in revealed religion; they wish to impose their own, but the overwhelming majority of the nation would rise and mutiny were there the slightest attempt to return to the condition preceding the Ferry laws. It is certain that the government's scheme of moral instruction was admirably conceived for the needs of France. It might have been used advantageously by the Church as a basis for religious teaching. This is an opinion shared by some French priests. If this teaching in some quarters has become atheistic, it is largely because of the unreasonableness of those who consider religion as their monopoly, and will attack any moral or religious teaching which is not under their control.

The Separation and its legal provisions have been rejected by the Vatican. It claims that

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

such a step should have been taken after the mutual consent of the signing parties, but such a course has never been pursued, and certainly all the concordats in France were abandoned without any such agreement. An understanding with Rome would have meant a national recognition that the Pope has a right to interfere in French secular matters, and this the people wished to avoid at any cost. The solution which has prevailed, contrary to the wishes of most intelligent Catholics, leaves clergymen as free as possible, but without any regular judicial title to the buildings in which they worship. Much wealth and many privileges were the price paid by French Catholics for rejecting a settlement which was honourable and fair. Rome had expected a terrible crisis and an uprising of the nation. The people fully realised on which side predominated the love of liberty and of fair play. The outcome of the crisis was most disappointing for the Vatican, as its representatives saw the perfect apathy of the masses at the sight of ecclesiastical disestablishment. The next chapter views the question as it forced itself upon the French mind in general in those days.

CHAPTER XV

THE CRISIS OF THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

IN the present conflict between the Church and the State, if the liberty of Catholics was threatened or destroyed, I should be the first to raise my voice in its behalf, for I believe in the political right of man to be or not to be religious, and, if he is, to be so in his own way. In the present crisis both sides claim that they are actuated by the spirit of loyalty to this principle. Each appeals to the non-partisan part of the nation in the name of freedom. There can be no better evidence of the national attitude toward liberty and fair play.¹ Historically, it is easy to demonstrate that the Catholic Church has always been hostile to liberty of thought, liberty of speech, and liberty of the press, not to speak of its unsympathetic attitude toward the larger

¹ L'Abbé Gayraud recognises that what the majority of French voters wish is "justice, equal for all, the equality of all before the law, religious toleration; that is, to use a popular expression, to leave people free, and that each may do as he pleases." (*La République et la paix religieuse*, p. 44.)

political liberty as viewed by Americans. Any one reading the encyclical letter *Quantâ Curâ* and the *Syllabus* of Pius IX in which liberty is called *delirium*, and "liberty of perdition," will be convinced upon this point.¹

Furthermore, wherever it can, the Church claims an exclusive position. This is evident from statements like the following, taught in the seminaries of France: "If in a country the unity of Catholic faith reigns, the State must not neglect anything to drive away novelties of doctrines and sophistries. In such a State, heresy is a public crime, because everything which is done against the divine religion touches all the members of society."² Again, in the same textbook of theology: "The Church has received from God the power to compel and repress those who go astray from the truth, not only by spiritual penalties, but also by temporal ones . . . these are prison, flagellation, torture, mutilation, and death."³

¹ Abbé Gayraud gives a list of some of the papal documents in which liberty is condemned: Pius VI, a brief of March 10, 1791, and a letter to Cardinal Loménie de Brienne; Gregory XVI, encyclical letter, *Mirari vos*, Aug. 17, 1832; Pius IX, encyclical letter, *Quantâ Curâ* and *Syllabus*, Dec. 8, 1864; Leo XIII, encyclical letters, *Quod apostolici*, *Arcanum divinæ sapientiæ*, *Humanum genus*, *Immortale Dei*, *Libertas præstantissimum*, *Sapientiæ Christianæ*, etc. (*La République et la paix religieuse*, p. 17.)

² Trouillot, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 52. Lacordaire was unheeded when, long ago, he said: "Catholics, if you wish liberty for yourselves, you must wish

Louis Veuillot, the ablest journalist that Catholics ever had in France, embodied the whole truth of this matter in one of those striking sentences of which he was a master: "When you, Republicans, are in power, we demand liberty — that is your principle; when we are, we refuse it to you — that is our principle."

The anti-clericals are all Republicans bound by their past to principles of liberty. When they have been inconsistent, it has been while enforcing laws made by their opponents against Free-thinkers and Protestants. Republicans have not been unerring; they have still much of the spirit of the Church which taught them, but, as a rule, they have worked to make liberty more real and to enlarge its scope. There are men among them who with Paul Bert have ever been ready to say, "No tolerance for the intolerant"¹ — men inclined to apply to clericals the ethical rule of David Harum, "Do unto others what they would do unto you, only do it

it for all men under all skies. . . . Give it where you are masters, so that it may be given to you where you are slaves. (Quoted by Chaigne, *Menus propos d'un catholique libéral*, p. 70.) M. J. de Narfon recognises that the Church has refused liberty to non-Catholics. (*Vers l'Eglise libre*, p. 254.) A zealous Parisian priest said to the writer: "We never spoke of liberty when we had the ascendancy."

¹ Rambaud, *Jules Ferry*, p. 108.

first"; but these men are only a noisy minority. As a rule, Republicans have worked and fought for the extension of impartial law.

The question, however, which dominated every other during the recent crisis has been, "Cannot France settle her national affairs as England has done, or as the United States does? Can she not decide, in her own way, what she will or will not do?" The clericals said No! France is bound to the Vatican by the Concordat which was a "bilateral contract," "a pact," "a compact," or something of the kind which could not be given up by one of the signers. Cardinal Gibbons made it a sort of matrimony between the Church and the State — a most unhappy reflection upon marriage, for the Concordat was the source of ceaseless wranglings, of ever-renewed controversies, of annoyances for the State, and humiliations for the Church, so that it was the worst kind of *discordat*. The Concordat was not a contract, or a compact, but a truce between two irreconcilable belligerents, the binding character of which lasted as long as its terms were not disregarded. Now it is perfectly evident that the obligations of this agreement were trampled under foot by the Church as well as by Napoleon.

Those acquainted with the history of the

French episcopate during the nineteenth century know that the bishops have not been true to their oath of loyalty to the various governments. Again, the character of the ecclesiastical régime contemplated was the Gallican; but, slowly and steadily, Rome has made it Ultramontane. Furthermore, it is quite certain that the presence of the orders was excluded. If we now turn from the statical violations of the Concordat to the dynamical, there is the bold protest of Pius X against the visit of M. Loubet in Rome. France and Italy had been estranged, and largely through the influence of the clergy, but now were reconciled. The King of Italy paid a visit to the President of the Republic — a visit which was returned in the Italian capital; but it called forth the irritating note from the Vatican which aroused the French people. Then came the dismissal of two bishops, contrary to the stipulations of the Concordat, whereby the Pope could not nominate bishops, and could not dismiss them without conferring with the government. This act was so universally resented that M. Delcassé first recalled the French Ambassador to the Vatican, and then, under the irresistible pressure of public opinion, he closed the Embassy. It must be said, however, that these violations would not have pro-

duced the disestablishment of the Church, had they not come at the end of a long and bitter struggle between Republicans and Clericals, to some extent between Paris and Rome.

It must be remembered that the clergy of France, in the early days of the Republic, had succeeded in gaining complete control of the political, administrative, and educational forces of the country. The Republicans under Jules Ferry accepted a definition of the Republic as *la chose de tous*, "everybody's affair," but the clergy had made it their own affair. They attempted to make the commonwealth their possession, as if France had been a South American republic. They ruled everywhere in Versailles and in Paris, over the President of the Republic as well as over the most humble State official. They placed their representatives everywhere and deprived non-Catholics of their essential liberties. Did they not go so far as to prohibit Free-thinkers from opening schools? Were not these Free-thinkers prevented from having civil or priestless funerals when they liked? Did not Prefect Duclos, in Lyon, fix, at six o'clock in summer and at seven o'clock in winter, *les enfouissements civils* — "the civil hidings in the ground?"¹ Was not Father

¹ Guyot, *Le Bilan*, etc., p. 81.

Hyacinth prevented from lecturing in Paris?¹ Did they not go so far in a certain town as to forbid a French pastor, called by the people, to speak to them, on the ground that there was no organised Protestant church in that community?

There has seldom been a more arrogant monopoly of religious liberty by one religious body. Excesses of all kinds against non-Catholics, and shocking partiality toward priests and monks, aroused the nation in such a way that the most religious men of the Church came to realise the religious estrangement which had taken place. Abbé Charles Perrault laments not only the reaction, but also the hatred, which had been called forth. "Gentlemen," said he with sadness and gentle irony, at the opening of a course of lectures in Paris in 1881, "I will be frank with you: at the sight of that tornado of wrath against us, I was seized with strange fears. The priest is the enemy of his country; the priest is the enemy of science, the enemy of progress, of liberty, of democracy."² In the eyes of Liberals,

¹ Séché L., *Jules Simon*, 1898, p. 228.

² *Le Christianisme et le progres*, p. 4. Twenty years later Abbé Gayraud made a similar statement. (*La République et la paix religieuse*, p. 272.) Comte d'Haussonville says: "What French democracy, right or wrong, reproaches the Church with is that she has an invincible regret for the time when the State considered itself . . . as the sergeant of Christ, and was ready to put the secular arm at the service of the spiritual Power — that she has

the priest, indeed, appeared as an enemy. It was he who urged Frenchmen to wage war against Italy for the recovery of the temporal power, a policy which could not be that of a friend of France.¹ It was he who maintained that the Church was above the State or tried to make it so. It was he who ever opposed the free scientist, was the foe of progress, and the apostle of mediæval ideals. Right or wrong, the intelligence of the country was arrayed against what was viewed as a yoke for the national mind. So strong was this conviction, and so deep were the feelings aroused by it, that the clerical forces were defeated everywhere. When the victorious Republicans remembered what unwise use the clergy had recently made of their special privileges, they determined to wrest from them every prerogative and every advantage which they held over and above other bodies of citizens.

not resigned herself to the neutrality of the Civil Power in dealing with different denominations and with the philosophical doctrines since the French Revolution — that she leans for the defence (of her claims) upon the support of the law; demands privileges, and does not accept frankly the new situation which has been created for her since Catholicism has ceased to be the State religion." (*Après la Séparation*, p. 65.) Mgr. Lacroix is even more emphatic: "The clergy of France are considered, in their own country, as a group of pariahs, as a separate caste, closed to all progress, to all light from the outside, hostile to all the aspirations of their contemporaries." (Chaigne, *Menus propos*, p. 87.)

¹ Séché, *Jules Simon*, p. 231.

Let me recapitulate the history of what then took place. They began by removing the bishops from the Superior Council of the Ministry of Public Instruction. The friars — not to mention the nuns — could teach in the public schools by virtue of a *lettre d'obédience* from their superior. The parliament decided that these monastics would have to provide themselves with a diploma like secular teachers. Both the authorised and the unauthorised orders played a very important part under MacMahon; now the Jesuits were dispersed and the unauthorised orders were requested to apply for authorisation. But they did not; they defied the law as they had defied public sentiment. The nuns in the hospitals had often manifested no little intolerance in dealing with non-Catholic patients, and, together with Catholic chaplains, had tried to bring into the Church patients *in extremis*. They had not infrequently organised what their enemies called *la chasse au cadavre* — corpse hunting. An inquiry of the parliament revealed facts of such a nature that it was voted to replace the nuns by professional nurses. The orders who with their mortmain property paid no inheritance tax, had to be brought down to a fairer basis, by paying annually an additional sum to make rates equal for the monks and the

common citizens. In all the public schools of France were taught Roman Catholic prayers and the Roman Catholic catechism, contrary to the wishes, and notwithstanding the protests, of non-Catholic parents. The parliament decided that prayers must go, and that the teaching of catechism must cease. For this the Republicans substituted moral instruction with a theistic basis; but the clergy opposed violently both the idea of change and the substitution.

In the schools, the court houses, and over the entrance of cemeteries were crucifixes, madonnas, and other indices of Roman Catholic devotion, before which every one had to stand or to pass. Anti-clericals objected to seeing these symbols of Roman Catholic power in places which were strictly public. By the recent action of the clergy these insignia, which in other times would have been unnoticed, became irritating. The parliament voted that they should be removed. The clerics, who, hitherto, had been excused from all military service, were asked to spend one year in the barracks — instead of two, the normal time then for all — to make them acquainted with the movements and life of the army, in which, during the time of war, they were to serve with the ambulance corps. The unauthorised orders, who had re-

fused to ask authorisation from the State twenty years before, were compelled, by the Law of Association, in 1901, to disband, though the authorised orders remained untouched. On July 7, 1904, at the instigation of M. Combes, a law was passed preventing the orders from teaching, though this change is to have ten years for its consummation.

Every one of these measures, not uniformly wise or uniformly just, was represented by the clericals as a war against the Church and against God. This threadbare accusation, repeated for a quarter of a century, has come to be regarded even by a large number of Catholics as an ecclesiastical cant phrase. The way in which the clericals defended their cause won them but few friends. Their attitude strained the relations on both sides. France became divided into two camps by a water-tight compartment of passion and hatred. It was then that the news of the protest of the Pope was spread. The national indignation knew no bounds; the French Ambassador was recalled. Thereupon it was learned that the Pope had dismissed two French bishops. Immediately the Concordat relations were at an end.

M. Combes was in some ways the man of the hour. His great talent had largely consisted

in keeping together all the anti-clericals. To the Clerical Bloc, owing its former power to its union and discipline, he opposed the Radical Bloc; both have had despicable methods. During the successive régimes of the nineteenth century, the Black Bloc always took advantage of the divisions of parties, or of the embarrassments of the government, to grasp some anti-Concordat privileges. Had this minister been longer in power and had not the incidents of Rome created a new situation, he would doubtless have done much to bring the Vatican back to a more faithful observance of its historic pledges. He had not worked for the severance of Church relations; but when it came, he was far from displeased. He lacked, however, the spirit of objective equity capable of organising the régime of liberty, and of framing laws of a just nature acceptable to all. The draft of a Bill of Separation made under him was narrow, vexatious, and tyrannical.

It was fortunate that at this juncture M. Briand was made chairman of the parliamentary committee appointed to elaborate the bill for the Palais Bourbon. The Protestants had been quite distressed over the bill. He asked them what would make it satisfactory. When they pointed out its deficiencies, he recognised their

justice, and convinced his colleagues that Protestant grievances were real; the bill was amended accordingly. The Israelites were asked the same question. When it was seen that they impugned only the harsh features of the Combes Bill, there was no reason for not giving them satisfaction. Similarly, M. Briand consulted with his Catholic colleagues; and these, all the while, had frequent conferences with the bishops. As they all — and rightly too — reproved the Combes Bill, he urged them to state what would make it acceptable in their eyes. Their wishes were so far granted that the Catholic members considered it satisfactory. The Combes Bill was a war measure, that of Briand was one of conciliation, of equity and liberty. It showed such a fair spirit that the committee — with its Catholic majority — voted to present the bill to the House. It secured the approval of all the deputies except the extreme *Reds* and the extreme *Blacks*. M. Briand could have made his own the words of Huxley: "Fanatics on both sides abuse me, so I think I must be right."¹

¹ *Life and Letters*, p. 389. Comte d'Haussonville praised M. Briand for his eloquence, his courage, his respect for liberty and for religious beliefs. (*Après la Séparation*, p. 20.) M. Chaigne, another Catholic, points out the conciliatory spirit of M. Briand which met with no encouragement on the part of Catholic deputies. (*Mémoires* n. 140.)

The brilliant debates in the popular Chamber only showed how well the Briand committee had wrought. The bill was passed by 388 votes against 146. In the Senate it was sustained by 179 votes against 103. This was the legal consummation of the Separation, after which the parliament appealed to the country. Notwithstanding the campaign carried on by the Vatican, by the clergy, by the clericals, and by every shade of conservatives, the Separation law received a national sanction never dreamed of by its promoters. This was not a catch vote, a tricky surprise of the French suffrage, but one in keeping with the Republican majorities which have been more or less constant, though largely increased, since the overthrow of Mac-Mahon.

No one could have convinced the French people that the Law of Separation was hard or ungenerous. This was most eloquently asserted in a "*Supplication*" to the Pope by the most distinguished Catholics of France headed by the late Ferdinand Brunetière. The law which on its very threshold guarantees "freedom of conscience" to all French citizens regardless of creed, could not be viewed as a "law of despotism" — the law which allowed Catholics to use the State Church buildings free of charge — the law

which accorded to Catholics the use of national episcopal palaces, national manses, the national seminaries for several years without compensation — the law transmitting to them the endowments under proper guarantees — the law which granted pensions to the amount of 27,000,000 to 30,000 Catholic priests and bishops — the law continuing their salaries for four years in many places and for eight years in twenty thousand villages of less than one thousand inhabitants; the law whereby two priests, nominated to their parishes two days before its promulgation, were entitled to their honorarium during four years, because of forty-eight hours of service¹ — this law could never be viewed by thoughtful persons as “a law of persecution.” The utterances of Catholic prelates of the world, including those of Cardinal Gibbons, seemed to Frenchmen a mark of unreasonableness typical of the Roman Catholic clergy. What was most unfair in their sweeping generalisations against what they called *the law of despotism* is that they gave people to understand that former conditions were more liberal, while in reality the Concordat, the *Articles organiques* that go with it, and the penal code of the First Empire which supplemented both, con-

¹ Lhermite and Verone, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

stituted for the Church an oppressive situation without precedent in French history.

The Concordat was not an agreement of principles, but the acceptance by Pope Pius VII of a situation. This acceptance was considered so humiliating and disgraceful for the Church, that it gave rise to a schism known as *la petite église*.¹ Joseph De Maistre, an extreme Ultramontane, characterises this act of Pius VII as follows: "The crimes of Alexander Borgia are less revolting than this hideous apostacy of his weak successor." The persecutions of Napoleon and those of Louis XVIII did not bring back all the malcontents, and *la petite église* has survived to this day. The Pope wrote to eighty-one bishops and, evincing little sense of humour, asked them to hand him their "spontaneous resignations" and to accomplish the "free act" which he imposed upon them, but thirty-six refused.² In 1809, when Napoleon seized Rome, Pius VII, seeing how he was treated by the Great Corsican, called him "the new Ahab." In the most shameful manner Napoleon made him his prisoner, sent him as such to Savona, then to Fontainebleau where, for five years, he remained in captivity. The emperor en-

¹ *Le Temps*, March 23, 1906; Narfon, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

² Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 98.

deavoured to turn the bishops against him, but in vain. He had some of them arrested, and, at his downfall, five hundred priests were in prison.¹

This is the man whose regulations the Catholics have lately idealised. By the Concordat, and the Organic Articles added by Napoleon and, for the fear of something worse, accepted by Rome, the Pope had scarcely any rights in France. He could not appoint bishops, create new dioceses, correspond with the clergy, except through the government. Now he may nominate and institute whomsoever he pleases, of whatever age he likes, double or halve the number of dioceses, correspond directly by such means as suit his convenience. He has *carte blanche* with all representatives of French Catholicism. According to the Concordat, the bishops could hold no national council, no provincial synod, no deliberative assembly of any kind; now they may have all possible national councils, hold any number of provincial synods or any other kind of representative gatherings. In 1801 they could not leave their diocese nor omit to visit every one of their parishes every five years. They could not start a new parish. They were obliged to take the oath of allegiance,

¹ Réveillaud, *ibid.*, p. 78.

and to be ordained after the ways of the Gallican Church. They could have but one seminary per diocese, and have none but Gallican professors; they could not ordain students unless they were twenty-five years of age and had an income of three hundred francs a year, and had secured the approval of the candidate by the government. They were not even free in the matter of their costume; they had to wear violet stockings. They were allowed but one liturgy and one catechism for the whole of France.

By the Law of Separation not one, *not even a little one*, of these restrictions survives. They are all swept away. By the Concordat situation the priests were compelled to take the oath of allegiance, recite prayers for the government, reside in their respective parishes, remain in one diocese, have no new religious holiday, use a definite calendar, avoid processions in the streets if there were other denominations in the town, avoid abusing other denominations in their preaching, omit all other exercises in their church except worship and preaching, perform religious marriages only after civil marriages had taken place, have a board of church-wardens, *fabriques*, for the preservation of church buildings and the distribution of charities. The nature of their

dress was also stated. Domestic chapels and private oratories were not allowed without the permission of the government. To crush *la petite église* and all Catholic dissent, no priest could exercise any function unless he belonged regularly to a diocese, that is, was regularly under a bishop. Furthermore, in the case of abuses, appeal was made, not to the Pope, but to the Council of State. The matter of marriages aside, all these limitations have been removed, and the Pope is the final authority in all religious questions, and as unrestricted in the legal exercise of his functions as in the freest land in the world. Napoleon subjected the Catholic clergy not only to the Concordat and the Organic Articles that go with it, but also to the Penal Code which punished clergymen with a really draconian severity, sending them to prison for criticism or censure of the government, of a law, of a decree, or of any other public act of the servants of the State. Nothing brings out the genuine liberal character of the Law of Separation like a comparison with the tyrannical character of the régime inaugurated by the Concordat.¹

¹ Strange to say, Caprara, the plenipotentiary of the Pope, speaks in his letters as if he had been more perplexed by matters of trivial importance than by this enslaving of the Church. (A. Debidour, *Histoire des rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat de 1789 à 1870*, p. 223.)

In presence of such facts one cannot understand the protests of Catholics if they speak of the liberty they enjoyed under the Concordat. At times under Catholic kings the authorities placed upon the clergy obligations as vexatious as ridiculous. Thus Minister Barthe sent a circular ordering the clergy to baptise with warm water in winter and with cold water in the summer. Similarly, under Louis Philippe, the government watched the clergy to see if they sang *Domine salvum fac regem* followed by *Ludovicum Phillippum*.¹ To-day they have not one of these annoyances.

Furthermore, the action of Pius X went against the grain of French Catholic feelings. We have already stated that the Catholic members of the parliamentary committee were working harmoniously with the bishops, and they thought that the Separation law was acceptable and would be accepted — that the most distinguished Catholics of France had pleaded with the Holy See to try it. The majority of the bishops had been in favour of a conciliatory attitude; but when the Pope rejected the law and commanded the Catholics to disobey the government of their country, his action was primarily due to the influence of Mgr. Lorenzelli, the nuncio, later on

¹ Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 210.

made Archbishop of Lucca — pronounced spitefully by many French Catholics *archevêque de Lucré* — suggesting thereby characteristics of an unworthy representative of the Vatican.¹ The decision of the Pope was most emphatically affected also by the advice of Mgr. Montagnini, a man signally incompetent to gauge the situation, and whose correspondence² has called forth most sincere pity for the Pontiff dependent upon such information.

The most striking fact, in connection with this event, is the satisfaction it seemed to produce in the minds of Frenchmen at large. The efforts made to disturb their impassibility have proven vain. The extreme language of the Pope, of the bishops, of the priests, and of their militant laymen has often been considered excessive by Catholics themselves, and always disingenuous by Free-thinkers. The latter have not infrequently, after discussing the reasons advanced by the clergy for the rejection of the law, pointed out, not without a little malice, that, while they, the clergy, rebelled against the new legal situation, they accepted the pensions. The priests rejected the law, but in cases where *associations cultuelles* complying with the new order of things secured the churches, they used this

¹ Narfon, *ibid.*, p. 303.

² *Les Fiches pontificales*, 1908.

same law to have the churches returned to them on the plea that *associations cultuelles* were not approved by the Pope. The courts decided in favour of the clergy on the ground that the purpose of the legislators was that Catholics in good standing should have the use of the churches. Here, again, Free-thinkers pointed out that, after rising against the law, the clergy were making use of it. There are those who had admired Pius X when he defiantly, and at a great cost, opposed the Republic; but when they saw the clergy take the pensions and use the law on account of its benefits — rejecting its obligations — the impression was painful.

The rank and file of parish priests are quiet and peace-loving. Were they left to themselves, they would not disturb the authorities. They are goaded to action by the bishops who of late have taken up arms against some of the text-books used in the common schools. As ever, they have been absolutely tactless. They made charges against the morality of teachers; but when these teachers threatened to sue them before the courts, they answered that the word *moral* as used by them did not mean what was reprehensible in the lives of teachers, but that they were out of touch with the Church. Again, as to the text-books they were forced to state

which ones were bad. Those indicated were so few that the people, who had hitherto given no attention to the matter, came to realise what a rich collection of sound manuals of moral teaching the nation has. Some had been used for years in Catholic schools without any complaint. The prelates have also assailed the historical text-books. They even dared to condemn Lavisser's *Histoire de France* — a book generally conceded to be admirably impartial.

In the interpellations which took place in parliament in January, 1910, it was shown that moral and historical teaching was far from ideal in the Catholic schools themselves. Minister Doumergue quoted the following from the text-book of morals used in Pas-de-Calais: "How much must one steal so that there should be a mortal sin?" The answer was: "From a poor man, one franc; from a working-man to the amount of a day's wages, that is, three or four francs; from a rich man, no matter how rich he is, ten or twelve francs."¹ His quotations from their histories are not better. It would be a thousand pities to judge the text-books on both sides by their deficiencies, for as a whole they are remarkable, but the aggressors must not be astonished if Republicans re-

¹ *Le petit Temps*, Jan. 19, 1910.

sent the attacks of the bishops against such books or their threats against the teachers whom they treat as if they were subordinates of the Church.¹ The incapacity of the prelates to state facts as they are is evident from an address of Bishop Laurans of Cahors, before the Court of Agen, whither he was summoned because of some of his utterances against the schools. "Formerly," he said, "no European was admitted into Japan without trampling the crucifix under foot. That hateful practice has long been suppressed in the Empire of the Rising Sun. But we do not wish that it should be established in the land of France, and that Catholic children should be compelled to deny their baptism before they cross the threshold of the common schools."² This is a fair specimen of the grotesque exaggerations of some of the bishops. One of their charges against the text-books of morals is that they do not teach the doctrine of "the original sin" or "the supernatural."³ For the non-Catholic children of the common schools they have no regard, and they aim at nothing short of having Catholic doctrines taught to them.

¹ *Le Temps*, Nov. 25, 1909.

² *Le Siècle*, July 31, 1909.

³ *Lettre pastorale collective des évêques de France*, 1909. Also *Ordonnance de condamnation de Mgr. Villard, évêque d'Autun*, 1909.

All this militant activity will avail the Church but little. Were the efforts made in various directions to overthrow the "rascally Republic" exerted to win, to instruct, and train the churchless masses to a better life, the clergy would soon regain some of their ascendancy. There is no longer the presumption that the priests are the tools of the government as formerly. Their purpose is not so likely to be misunderstood, though now they are regarded as the passive instruments of Rome. They realise that the people are no longer with them. It would be well for the Pontiff of Rome to accept the Separation defeat and to consider his political preponderance of former days as gone — to look at it as to the loss of the Comtat of Avignon, to that of the Papal States and even to that of the temporal power, which is scarcely now anything more than a memory. Let him realise that French democracy has passed a final judgment upon this great issue, and that the nation will never again agree to a virtual papal protectorate over the country — that it has provided free and unrestrained conditions for his true work, and that none of the great powers — America, England, or Germany — have ever displayed more patience in dealing with his excessive claims.

CHAPTER XVI

CONTEMPORARY FRENCH PROTESTANTISM

FRENCH Protestantism is an offshoot from Catholicism. Its relations to the old historic Church are different from those which American Protestant churches sustain to the Church of Pius X. That of France is an ever-protesting Protestantism, growing away from the old Church, and yet still feeling its influence for good or for evil at every step. The blunders of Rome have often proven calamities for French Protestants. To be just one must remember that, contrary to common opinion, Catholicism never completely conquered the native religions of France — that beneath many of the religious practices in some districts are still the earlier faiths, the cults of the Druids, and, in Brittany, to this day, druidical gods are still worshipped under the name of saints, though these saints are not in the Roman Catholic calendar. In many parts of France still survive prac-

tices, with no religious character, but which are remnants of primitive cults. French Protestants all along have fought what they considered the superstitions of Catholicism, which were, in reality, the survival of the old ethnic religions which the clergy never were able to extirpate. Again, at the height of her power, the Church almost worshipped theological, philosophical, and ecclesiastical immobility. For her the most dreaded enemy was the innovator. In this French reformers were at one with the Catholic clergy. When they were accused of being innovators, they denied the charge. They simply wished, they asserted, to go back through past changes to Christ; they were the true conservatives. The idea of progress had never entered as yet into the French mind. It was in the name of conservatism that Protestants began their work. Their religious conceptions were shaped by one of the greatest men who ever lived, John Calvin, who inspired and to some extent organised the churches of France. The first Protestant church was formed at Meaux in 1525, and from that time to the dawn of the French Revolution, with only one important break of continuity, the history of French Protestants is a long martyrdom, with paroxysms of intensity, such as the Massacre of Vassy, the Massacre of

St. Bartholomew's Day, the Dragonades, and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. In 1685 the seven hundred pastors who were left were compelled, within the space of two weeks, either to recant or to leave the realm. Their churches were destroyed, their schools closed, and their property confiscated. Their books were sought for and burned. From 1678 to 1802, no Protestant version of the Bible nor any other Protestant literature was printed in France.

It is estimated that at least five hundred thousand Huguenots fled during these persecutions. Some found their way to South Africa where French names are still common among the Boers. Some fled to Switzerland, the French part of which contains, to-day, a large Huguenot population. Others sought refuge in Germany, where we find the town of Fredericksdorf with its archaic French tongue, its French customs, and its French Protestant liturgy in the church. Still others fled to Holland, where there are yet nearly a score of French churches. Many reached England, and we find still in Bristol and Norwich unused Huguenot churches, as well as a very prosperous one in London. In the crypt of the Canterbury Cathedral French services, inaugurated at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, have not been discontinued to this day.

Not a few of these noble exiles came to America, made large settlements in the South, had churches in New York, were predominant in the settlement of Kingston, founded New Paltz, New Rochelle, settled in Massachusetts, and were numerous in Boston where Faneuil Hall was named after one of them. Bowdoin College also bears the name of a Huguenot. The total emigration is conceded to have been half a million persons, and it is estimated that had it not been for the Revocation, France would have now, at least, six million Protestants instead of seven hundred thousand. Those who emigrated carried everywhere a highly respected name, were thrifty, broad-minded, and progressive, God-fearing men.

Of the ministers who remained at home after the Revocation, about one hundred were put to death. All Protestants were subjected to a barbarous treatment which set on fire the soul of Voltaire against their oppressors. Children were torn from the arms of their parents to be taken to convents, where they were taught Catholicism. The poor Huguenots were seen crossing France, chained with vile criminals, on their way to the galleys. One of them was condemned for life because he had taught boys to sing psalms. It was a crime, punishable as

such, to give them shelter or to fail to denounce them to the authorities. As late as 1767 a Protestant minister was executed because he was a Protestant minister. Yet these Huguenots, as a whole, remained remarkably steadfast. They would walk the greatest distances to hear preachers upon whose heads a great price had been set, and whose voices seemed to echo the preaching of the early martyrs of the Church. They gathered and worshipped by night, in the unpopulated parts of the country, and their meetings became known as those of the Church in the Desert. They were often surprised by the king's soldiers, fired upon, killed or captured; the men were sent to the galleys for life and the women to prison. Marie Durand spent thirty-six years in the Tour de Constance at Aigues-Mortes, and Madame Guizot, the mother of the historian, was hit by a bullet at a night service in the fields near Nîmes.

The Huguenots, even in these circumstances, dared to hold a synod in an old abandoned quarry of the South. One may realise what the persecution must have been by the fact that of the first signers of the minutes of this synod, four died the martyr's death. Until the very eve of the French Revolution they were still forced to go to mass and were ostracised by law. What

was most galling for them, and worked most deeply into their moral sensitiveness, was that Protestant marriage was considered null, and that they, the puritans of the puritans, the purest men and women of Europe, were looked upon as living in concubinage. Their greatest grief was that their children were considered illegitimate. The Church did not cease her relentless persecution of Protestants until the eve of the French Revolution. As late as 1774, when Louis XVI was crowned at Rheims, he was virtually forced to take the following oath: "I swear that I will apply myself sincerely and with all my power to exterminate, in all the lands under my dominion, the heretics particularly condemned by the Church." However, the sentiment fostered by Voltaire along the line of toleration, the influence of the Encyclopedists and the efforts of La Fayette brought about the Edict of Toleration of 1787, which gave the Huguenots a relief, soon to be eclipsed by the French Revolution. Some of the men who had survived the persecutions of the *Ancien Régime* perished during the mad excesses of the *Terreur*. This closes the first period of their history.

Two or three considerations must be borne in mind at this point. In the first place, Huguenot history renders to the Christian Church and

to historical science a great service in being a complete refutation of the historic theory of races as the ultimate determinants of religion. The study of the rise and development of French Protestantism shows us how untenable is the assertion that Germanic nations are Protestant and that the Celtic are Catholic. We know positively now that man was present in France during the paleolithic and the neolithic periods. During thousands and thousands of years of prehistoric times man dwelt there, and numerous immigrations followed one another up to the time of the Roman Conquest. Then came the Germanic invasions and constant ethnological contributions of the whole world to the French people, who are therefore neither Celtic nor Latin, but mixed to the highest degree, with a preponderance of Celto-Germanic elements.

Anthropology enables us to locate the parts of the country which are particularly Celtic or Germanic. Now it happens that the districts in which Protestants are most numerous are not Germanic, and the most important part of the nation which contains the most numerous Germanic population is Catholic. The same thing is true in Switzerland where the French are Protestant and the Germans are often Catholics. It is so in Belgium where Protestantism is mak-

ing rapid gains among the French and has no encouragement among the Flemish who are Germanic. This is very important, for the Gobineau doctrine is not only historically erroneous, but it saps the very foundation of Christian teaching. It is a return to Judaism which makes blood, rather than spiritual forces, the great determinant of religion.

A second consideration is that the exile and the partial destruction of the Huguenots not only took away the best men of France morally, but also those of the greatest intellectual elasticity. This loss of the Huguenots was a most unnatural selection, for it was the elimination of the best and the noblest. The men who succeeded in making their escape were men of means, and acquainted with the countries near them. The poorer, the less enterprising, and the least educated remained at home. The stock from which the Protestants of France have issued, though a remarkable stock, is a stock of remnants revived by their faith and the inspiration of their ancestry.

It has been customary to speak of Napoleon I as the restorer of religion in France by the Concordat, but the religious life had resumed its normal course long before this time. In 1796, 32,214 churches were already reopened to

Catholic worship, and 4,571 were on the eve of being reopened. A year later Bishop Lecoq of Rennes asserts that 40,000 parishes were provided with priests.¹ In 1795 the Protestants reopened their churches and resumed their ecclesiastical life. The exceptional situation of all Protestant churches in France at this time was scarcely abnormal for them, for these sons of the Reformed churches had long been accustomed to live under hostile edicts, to bear régimes of petty toleration, and to endure barbarous persecutions.

To many, however, the great Corsican appeared as the restorer of Protestantism. Indeed, he assured them that they should enjoy "freedom of worship" and stated a great political truth, which he forgot in practical life, when he said: "The realm of the law ends where the indefinite realm of conscience begins." Neither the Church nor the State had ever gone that far even theoretically. However, he refused them their synodal organisation, so essential to their ecclesiastical life; he prevented them from giving a constitutional expression to their faith he suppressed their parishes and established instead, consistories whose members were elected by those paying the most taxes; he gave a cer-

¹ Debidour, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

tain freedom to these organisations, but prevented them from working together;¹ he took away the power of the churches over their pastors, who were settled for life and became State officials — thus reducing the Church to a part of the State machinery. He gave Protestants, however, guaranties which were new. To these sons and daughters of martyrs, for whom persecution had almost always been a concomitant of life, he virtually said: “You will, hereafter, enjoy all the privileges of citizenship, your marriages shall be honored, your children freed from former disgrace, and your sons, when their merit and character shall designate them, may be elevated to high military and civil distinctions. You will have your own churches, your own organisations, protected by the government; your worship regulated and safeguarded by law; your pastors paid by the State. They will come, in state functions, immediately after Catholic bishops, but on a par with them.” This was far more than the Protestants had ever expected. He did much for them. He knew the value of Protestantism as a social discipline, as a principle of order, and as an instrument of government.

¹ Bersier, *Histoire du synode général de l'église réformée de France*, vol. I, p. xxx.

Protestants sounded the praises of their benefactor. One of their preachers, in Strasburg, six years after the Concordat, took his text from Luke I, 32, "He shall be great,"¹ and made that prophetic reference to Jesus apply to Napoleon. Three years later, on the occasion of the opening of the School of Protestant Theology of Montauban, the dean chose for his text, or rather for his pretext, Ezra VII, 27, "Blessed be the Lord God of our fathers, which hath put such a thing as this in the king's heart, to beautify the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem."² The "king" here is Napoleon and the "house of the Lord" is the school of theology. The Protestants lacked, as do all the persecuted, the necessary poise for a true appreciation of the course of the "Man of Might." What else could have been expected from men who had but a very imperfect education, and had lived through the terrible disabilities of the *Ancien Régime* and the horrors of the French Revolution?

Their theology went scarcely beyond a mere theism with the acceptance of the miraculous

¹ Vincent A., *Histoire de la prédication de langue française au dix-neuvième siècle*, p. 19.

² Sardinoux A., *Mémoire universitaire et ecclésiastique sur la Faculté de théologie protestante et le Séminaire de Montauban*, 1888, p. 34.

element of the Bible, but was far away from even the broadest Christology of modern evangelical churches.¹ Their preaching hardly ventured outside of the affirmations of natural religion. Some of them had read English deists, but not the works of their critics, such as Butler and others. Their pulpit themes were moral commonplaces, such as "The Beauty of Virtue," "The Ugliness of Vice," "Politeness," "Respect Due to Old Age," "Hasty Judgments," "False Confidence in Prosperity," and "The Advantages of Mediocrity."² The divinity of Jesus is almost never referred to. "He came," they say, "to reveal the moral law more clearly to us." His kingdom is "the kingdom of moral order over wills and the perfect harmony between virtue and happiness." "His mission," declares another, "is to renew the ordinances of justice." "He has become our guide," says yet another, "in the path of truth."³ This homiletic superficiality was soon broken through by the influence of Germany which taught Protestants how to study the Bible, to fathom theology, and to deepen religion. Thereupon arose a movement which gave a new character to this intellectual progress. From Switzerland and

¹ Bersier, *ibid.*, p. xxxiv.

² Vincent A., *op. cit.*, p. 5.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

from Great Britain came an irresistible wave of religious impulse which awakened the churches to an unusual spiritual fervour. This period is known in French Protestant history as *Le Réveil*. Again, the British, and later on the Americans, taught French Protestants how to make a spiritual use of their knowledge by organising their religious works.

This foreign influence was not an unmixed good, for from across the Rhine came rationalism and from Great Britain a superficial Biblicism and a needless Protestant denominationalism. France had already Lutherans as well as Calvinists; to these were now added Free-Churchmen, Methodists, Baptists, Adventists, Swedenborgians, Campbellites, and several others. French Quakers were not an importation, for in France this body existed probably as early as that of England, though the two bodies were unknown to each other.¹ All these denominations, with a certain amount of self-reliance and different organisations, exerted, as a whole, a good influence upon the Huguenot churches, goading them to a greater activity. French Protestants have had their ideas coloured also by Catholicism. In the matter of pastoral relations their ministers are yet endowed with

¹ Jaulmes E., *Les Quakers français*.

a semi-sacerdotal function, and the communion itself is, for some, a sacrament, imparting, externally, a divine grace; at times, when given to the sick, it is a virtual extreme unction. This is not the direct result of teaching but of traditions, and, above all, of the force of example continually before them. All French Protestants feel constantly the power of the Catholic Church either by imbibing her ideas or by way of anti-Catholic reaction. When this is the case, they become sensitive to the influence of materialistic thought. Among the advanced Liberals there is often no little sympathy with extreme materialists. In their contact with these men they absorb their optimism which gradually displaces the pessimistic moroseness of a large number of Protestants. It must be admitted that, without giving up any particular doctrine, they have assimilated hedonistic notions so far advocated only by Positivists.

The influence of relations with the State has been felt all along and especially by the Evangelical element. The evil of the system was the lack of spiritual independence and only a partial subordination to the spiritual head of the Church. With all our admiration for the Liberals we cannot but deplore their fear of losing State support and their lack of faith in

their own adherents. Standing boldly for an unrestricted freedom of theological thought, they have clung tenaciously to a most humiliating system of State-Church despotism.

The numerical growth of the churches has not been great. Pastor Perrenaud calculates from reliable data in the correspondence of Rabaut-Dupuis that in 1802 there were 428,000 Protestants in France.¹ M. Frank Puaux, from another source, sets them at 525,000.² To halve the sum of these two estimates would give us 475,000 Protestants at the beginning of the nineteenth century. They number now about 700,000. The numerical gain has therefore been relatively small, but their advance in other respects has been very important. The formula which represents their history during the last hundred years is the expansion of life.

The first manifestation of this expansion was the making of a new ministry. At first the pastors received a superficial training in Geneva. Later on a school of theology was revived in Montauban. The programme of preparation for the ministry was fairly good, but theological students were far from displaying a proper spirit. Some there were who chose the ministry to

¹ *Etude historique sur les progrès du protestantisme en France*, 1889, p. 201.

² *Les œuvres du protestantisme français au XIX^e siècle*, p. xxxi.

avoid military service. The habits of a considerable number were such that the authorities repeatedly threatened with punishment those "seen in café-houses, in billiard-halls, at the theatre, at balls, and in gambling places."¹ Later another school was opened in Strasburg, but after the Franco-Prussian War it was transferred to Paris. The students in both schools of theology now are morally and spiritually equal to those of Protestant institutions anywhere. Three preparatory schools, with a healthy religious and intellectual atmosphere, lead their students to the baccalaureate of letters which is required for entrance to the regular course in the theological schools. The Protestant primary schools, once quite numerous, were merged into those of the State, under the Third Republic, because the principle of freedom of conscience which had occasioned their creation had triumphed, as a whole, in common schools. Most pastors began their education there. Friendly to every form of progressive education, Protestants, helped by the State, wished to have ministers broadly trained, and through them to bring all the world of truth, of philosophy, and of science to the service of religion. What a contrast between the Protestant clergy of seventy

¹ Sardinoux, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

years ago and that of the present! Thus, on May 1, 1839, four hundred and twenty-eight men were in different capacities exercising pastoral functions, and only one was a university man.¹ The ninety or one hundred ministers of 1802 have become at least one thousand who constitute a ministry second to none, if we consider merely intellect and conduct. The calling is highly honoured. That remarkable Monod family, which has produced such uncommon men in various walks of life, has a dozen representatives in the ministry at the present hour. It is not infrequent that all the sons of a pastor become ministers. At the Synod of Paris, in 1872, it was said that one of the delegates present had found himself, on one occasion, surrounded by seventeen pastors, former members of his Bible classes.² These pastors are bound together not only by ecclesiastical ties, but also by many organisations the aim of which is greater qualification for their ministry, mutual culture, and mutual help.

As to their tenets, the most rationalistic pastors, to judge from their preaching, are more religious than the men of Napoleon's time, while the others represent a broad and, as a whole, an earnest orthodoxy, ranging from that of men

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

² Bersier, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

like Drs. Abbot, Gordon, and Moxom to that of Pierson and Moody. In all bodies of men, we can, at best, strike averages; the average of intelligence, of earnestness and consecration among French Protestants is high, although they have their unworthy members and their ecclesiastical parasites. They are generally esteemed by their flocks for their sincerity and the absence of subtleties which are so common among theologians. They are respected inside and outside of their congregations. Owing to the lack of development of the lay element in the churches, the pastors might often say, *L'Eglise, c'est moi*. Under the system ended by the Separation, the Church, the real Church, counted for but little; the pastor was preacher and virtual administrator of his flock. This has now come to an end. In many ways French pastors have exerted much power by themselves, and often also by their sons and their daughters. In general the sons of ministers are important rising social factors. When one thinks of the untrained half-deistical pastors of a century ago and the thousand active and fairly progressive pastors of to-day, he is sensible of a marvellous change.

Another manifestation of this Protestant life is the making of most important instruments for

church work. In 1802 the sons of the Huguenots had not one page of printed matter which they could use as their own, no religious literature, and no Bibles. It took them twenty years to furnish themselves with copies of the Scriptures, and these were obtained only with exceptional difficulty. Now they have Bible societies, not to speak of the British and Foreign Bible Society which works with them and employs half a hundred colporteurs to spread the sacred volume throughout the land. Together these societies have distributed in France not far from fifteen million Bibles and New Testaments. It is difficult to exaggerate the good work of their Tract Society whose publications have generally maintained a high level. Years ago Saint-Marc-Girardin read one of these tracts before his hearers at the Sorbonne, illustrating a literary point which he was discussing.¹ The Protestant Publication Society circulates good, healthy books which, though not very literary, meet a popular want. Never has a small religious body made a greater use of the press. Three of their reviews are really valuable — *La Revue chrétienne*, *La Revue de Théologie*, and *Foi et Vie*. For over half a century they have had a historical society

¹ Saint-Marc-Girardin, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, vol. I, p. 74.

which has displayed great energy in collecting and publishing documents of a most valuable character upon the history of their fathers. Indeed, among French Protestants, reverence for ancestors takes the form of a cult. To honour them is in their mind an homage to the Great Power that made them great.

Though they have been inclined to translate the best works of foreigners and have assimilated much of the best foreign thought, Protestants have produced a large number of books of considerable power, many of which have had the honour of being translated beyond French frontiers. The great work of Edouard Reuss, *La Bible*, the *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses* by the *élite* of French Protestant thinkers, the historical and philosophical works of de Pressensé, of other theologians and literary men reflect great credit upon their intellectuality. Their women writers, Arvède Barine, Madame Coignet, Madame de Pressensé, Madame Bersier, and many others have produced works of high moral worth, as broad in their human sympathies as loyal to their religious ideals.

Another manifestation of their life is philanthropy. They have over forty orphanages and their homes for the aged are equally numerous. It is difficult to give an adequate idea of their

charities. The theological students of Paris and Montauban, aside from various other organisations, have societies to visit and help the poor. The deaconesses have in their institution a preparatory department for training new sisters, a hospital, and a reform school for girls. There are several such schools for boys. The Asylums of John Bost give shelter to the victims of the most harrowing forms of human malady — the incurable, the epileptic, and the insane. There are institutions for the deaf and the blind, homes for children whose mothers are in hospitals, children's summer outings, convalescent homes, homes near mineral springs like those of Vichy, or of Aix-les-Bains for special diseases, homes on the sea-shore for the tired and the sick, dispensaries, employment bureaus, loan associations for the poor, societies of friends of apprentices — these are very numerous — a society of ladies visiting the sick in hospitals, societies of relief by labour, the Society of the *Fourmis* (Ants) which has seven or eight thousand young women sewing for the poor, the asylum for young girls morally abandoned, the work for fallen women, the work among women in prison, a society to help liberated prisoners, an asylum for labourers without work, a society of colonisation, a Christian home for servants, homes for working-

women, and many other kindred organisations. Most of this work might have for its motto the beautiful inscription which the Bernese poet, Haller, placed upon the hospital of his city, *Christo in pauperibus*. Whatever may be the imperfections and deficiencies of French Protestants, they neglect neither the sick nor the poor. The significant parting words of their pastors at the close of the service are: "Go in peace and forget not the poor."

Another manifestation of French Protestant life is their missions. Long hampered by a legislation which prevented them from holding meetings of more than twenty persons — unless they had a permit from the authorities, and it was almost always refused — they, none the less, have accomplished much. In 1833 they founded the Evangelical Society of France, which is un-denominational, and, later on, the Central Society, which is the home missionary society of the Reformed Churches. For many years the Evangelical Society of Geneva has worked in France, and the Free-Churches have also an organisation for special missionary work. All together they have from seven to eight hundred mission stations. In this no mention is made of the work of the Methodists who have twenty-five or thirty churches and an efficient corps

of local preachers; that of the Baptists with about a score of earnest churches; the McAll Mission with its halls, its methods, and its aggressive spirit; the Evangelical Society of Brittany, among the sturdy old-fashioned Bretons; the Mission in the High Alps among the French Waldensians; the missions among the soldiers; the work among priests; the summer organisation of services in watering-places, etc. Very important are the missionary ventures of foreigners in France, and yet the most important force of church expansion is from the churches themselves.

If from home we pass to foreign missions, we find many establishments in Algeria and Tunis, on the northern side of what is fast becoming "Black France." Protestants have missions in Senegal and the French Congo. The French missionaries have evangelised and civilised the Basutos in South Africa. This is one of the most perfect missionary triumphs in any part of the world. Then they have entered the Zambesi Valley, the most deadly field for missionaries and one where numerous graves mark the end of the career of those heroic servants of God and humanity. During the last ten years French Protestants have centred their chief efforts in Madagascar where, with Norwegian and

English missionaries, they are doing an admirable work through their hospitals for lepers, their schools, and churches. Moving eastward, we find them in Indo-China, then in the Pacific Ocean. They do a most efficient work in New Caledonia and in the Society Islands, in Polynesia. Without making any depreciatory comparisons with the missionaries of any other nationality or church, it may be fearlessly asserted that French missionaries have cultivated the heroic spirit to an unusual degree. Were we to look for the best traits of the old Huguenots in their descendants, we should find them in the French Protestant missionaries more than anywhere else. Their missions are their most perfect work and the most praiseworthy display of their energy. They have refrained from all non-religious entanglements, and refused to be political instruments of any government. Their missions are purely educational and religious.

Another great manifestation of life is to be found in the men whom Protestantism has produced. Senator Lodge has ably recognised this in the case of the Huguenots. "The largest number of men who have attained distinction, in this country, in proportion to their immigration is undoubtedly given by France." He

had in mind French Protestant exiles. Madame de Staël, the author of *Corinne* and of *De l'Allemagne*, belonged to the Reformed Church. So also did Benjamin Constant, the political writer and orator; Cuvier, the founder of palæontology; de Quatrefages, the distinguished anthropologist; Léon Say and Gide, political economists; Guizot, de Pressensé, Boutmy, Gabriel Monod, E. Doumergue, and Frank Puaux, historians; Scherer, the great literary critic; Weiss, the brilliant dramatic critic, and André Michel, one of the foremost art critics of to-day; the two Stapfers, one a literary critic and the other a theologian; the three Sabatiers, unrelated except religiously — Armand, the biologist; Paul, the biographer of St. Francis of Assisi, and Auguste, the philosopher and theologian; Adolphe Monod, Bersier, and Wagner, great preachers and moral teachers; Delessert, who founded French savings banks; Henri Monod, who did more than any other man to organise national charities; Jules Siegfried, the pioneer in France of the national society of homes for working-men; Admiral Jauréguiberry, well known for his bravery during the Franco-Prussian War, and Col. Denfert-Rochereau, for his heroic defense of Belfort. Many more might be mentioned who have been distinguished servants of France and mankind.

The high scientific culture of the professors of Protestant theology has inspired such respect that their faculties were supported by the government, as branches of French universities, after the Catholic faculties had been cut off. Their ablest men take a high place in the world of thought. They have their members in every academy of the French Institute. They have professors in the Collège de France, in the Sorbonne, in the School of High Graduate Studies, in the School of Oriental Languages, in the School of Law, and in many other institutions of learning. They are largely represented in the Senate, in the Chamber of Deputies, and in the diplomatic service. The governor who perished at Martinique was a Protestant and his successor, Governor Lemaire, is one also. The government knows the worth of Protestant integrity. Protestants are conspicuous in the industrial and in the banking world. Baron Mallet, who died recently, was long the president of the Bank of France. A gentleman of large experience made the statement in presence of the writer that they are in great demand as treasurers of corporations. This is certainly a tribute to their character.

One prominent feature of this Protestant life — as of all life — is its self-organising power.

Whenever a religious function of any kind seemed desirable an organ to carry it on was created. Hence the numerous and timely organisations formed under the Republic. The old synods, interrupted by Louis XIV at Loudun in 1660, were resumed by permission of the government in 1872.¹ Synods were an essential part of the ecclesiastical life of French Protestants, for without them there was no possible doctrinal or spiritual discipline. For the better part of a century two conflicting tendencies were thereby strongly developed which practically gave rise to two different bodies with one common church machinery. They were constantly in touch; they worshipped in the same *temples*, as they call their meeting-houses; they even had the same officers, and often the same pastors. When the churches were large they could have both a conservative and an advanced pastor; there would be a rationalistic sermon in the morning and an evangelical one in the afternoon, or *vice versa*. By a natural grouping, the pastor of each side had his own followers; but that arrangement generated no little friction, and, furthermore, the small churches were obliged to have an evangelical pastor when many were Unitarians, or a Unitarian pastor when a large contingent was

¹ Bersier, *op. cit.*

evangelical. This was an abnormal situation, bound to last as long as Protestants held their State relations.

In 1878 the Evangelicals organised what they called the *Synod officieux*, a working synod of their own forces, while they remained in the State ecclesiastical body. By so doing they could control all the works which they sustained so liberally. Within the State organisation they introduced a strictly Presbyterian one, looking after their religious interests. Thus, while their pastors were still paid by the State, and they continued to worship in buildings belonging to the State, in other respects they were free to direct and control every form of their Christian activities sustained by their own gifts. Similarly, the Liberals, among whom are some of the noblest spirits of the land, founded a kindred organisation which they called the Liberal Delegation. With all their culture and their claims that they alone can meet modern religious inquiries, their endeavours to reach the people have been frail and spasmodic, and the results disappointing. Their efforts to reach the churchless have been few and have lacked the aggressive spirit of apostleship. In the supreme test of religious earnestness — giving — they are far from liberal. These two organisations were

tending to make the State ecclesiastical machinery useless, when the Separation came to destroy it and left the two branches of French Protestantism virtually organised, and bound to steer by their respective charts. There are, therefore, now two — in fact three — organisations of the Huguenot churches, the Evangelical, the Liberals, and a middle group of those opposed to the ecclesiastical division, and who, endeavouring to prevent it, constitute a third group which is not likely to be long-lived. Steps have already been taken to federate all the eight hundred and fifty Protestant churches of the country, for the furtherance of their common interests. The *Réformés* as a whole were not anxious to have the Separation, but now that it has come they have faced it courageously, not to say gladly. They have easily provided for their pastoral and church expenses, but it is to be hoped that their other works may not suffer during the period of transition. Henceforth the relations between the pastors of the churches will be pleasanter as they will be free from the old friction. Religion will be preached with more directness and more cumulative effect. There is work for both branches of the Huguenot churches to do, and in doing it they should lay stress upon what Guizot called “the moral

ceptions as a strong insistence upon thinking and also upon right thinking. Even the most conservative, who view the leading trend of modern thought with suspicion, are progressive and accept loyally all the advanced institutions of our day. As a whole, they affect those who have different doctrines and different ideals. Free-thinkers, like Renan and Taine, had their children taught by Protestant pastors. Renouvier became one of their best friends, if not one of their adherents. Some of the foremost philosophers have come to sympathise with the liberalism of Protestants at large, while Taine requested that at his death the rites of religion should be performed by a Protestant pastor. On the other hand, Catholics of a liberal type have relaxed their former mistrust, read the best Protestant literature, come in touch with Protestant life so that conservative Catholics have called attention to "Protestant infiltrations" and sounded the alarm in presence of the "Protestant Peril." The truth is that Protestantism in France has been a mediating force between the extreme forces of Catholicism and Materialism, thereby bringing them nearer and inspiring them to some extent with its liberalism and its spiritual life.

INDEX

- Administration, citizens not at the mercy of officials as during the Empire, 15; ballot-box free, 16; taxes collected with less expense and by gentler methods, 71.
- Africa, North, gradual control of, 7; agreement with Spain concerning, 28; historical research in, 118.
- African university, 82.
- Agglomerations, rise of large, 49.
- Agricultural schools, 44.
- Agriculture, Ministry of, 44; causes of improvement in, 45; action of government, 45; mutual loan banks, 45; co-operative associations, 46.
- Alcoholism, taxes removed from hygienic drinks, 71; growth of, 156; causes of, 160; work against it, 160.
- Algenciras, the Powers at, 28.
- Algeria, land still largely in possession of natives, 38.
- Alliance française*, 89.
- Analysis of Separation Law, 293; of Organic Articles, 324.
- Anti-clericals, often anti-religious, 178; have the educated on their side, 281; viewed State Church as storm centre, 282; now where clericals were 38 years ago, 283; victorious, 288.
- Archibald, James F. J., opinion of French colonies in Algeria and Tunis, 38.
- Army, ignorance of officers in 1870, 30; peace and war footing, 31; more democratic, 31; defensive purpose of, 31; humanisation of service, 32; transforms men of ignorant districts, 32; services in Madagascar, 32; services in Morocco, 32; services rendered to science, 33, 125; colonial, 37; expenses for reorganisation, 69; budget for, 69.
- Art à l'école (L')*, 76.
- Arts, decorative, 101.
- Asceticism passing away, 170.
- Assembly, National, 11.
- Association law, 270, 272.
- Associations, agricultural, 46; dangers of, 18; *associations culturelles*, 328.
- Assumptionists, 259.
- Asylums, 148.
- Atheism, before the present Republic, 175; rejected unworthy conceptions of God, 179; not common, 179; exceptional in philosophical world, 182; some teachers wish to drop God from moral instruction, 230; charges of atheism of schools, 306.
- Audiffret-Pasquier, d', 8.
- Aumale, Duc d', 11.
- Automobiles, use in colonies, 40; making and export, 51.
- Avenel, Comte Georges d', 13, 63, 65, 173, 178, 188, 208, 227.
- Ballot-box, freedom of, 15.
- Banc des pauvres*, 75.
- Banc des riches*, 75.
- Banks, agricultural mutual loan, 45; Bank of France, 59, 60; paid up capital of banks, 60; Bank of France and Bank of England, 61; savings-banks, 66.
- Becquerel, 134.

- Bérenger, senator, 8; law, 25;
Manuel pratique, etc., 106.
- Bergson, 108.
- Berthelot, 8, 129.
- Birth-rate, 159; *alliance nationale pour l'accroissement de la population française*, 159.
- Bishops, American, against French schools, 235; co-operation with orders, 264; Bishop Dupanloup opposed law of religious freedom for all, 285; ultramontane opposed to liberal, 290; protestation of Bishop of Cambrai, 296; restraints of the Concordat upon, 324; attacking schools, 329.
- Bismarck provoked war, 26.
- Bodley, France well governed, 17.
- Bonds, *rentes*, increased value, 72.
- Boucicaut, profit sharing, 139.
- Bourgeois, Léon, 171.
- Breton, Jules, 43, 99.
- Briand, 235; chairman of parliamentary committee, 319, 320; praised by Comte d'Haussonville, 320; praised by M. Chaigne, 320.
- Broca, senator, 8; gift of anthropological collection, 83; anthropologist, 133.
- Brunetière, critic, 92; orator, 95; self-made man, 207.
- Budget for 1910, 68.
- Budget for education in Africa, 37.
- Buisson on religious character of schools, 227; anti-clerical, 281.
- Cabinet noir*, 15.
- Cambon, Jules, 168.
- Carnot, 6.
- Cars, transformation of railroad, 40.
- Casimir-Périer, 6.
- Catholic, education, 88, 215; Institute of Paris, 104; universities, 185; periodicals, 185; theological literature, 184; teaching of philosophy, 106; charities, 149; criticism of "godless" schools, 214, 306; criticism that common schools would increase crime, 164; schools, sacrifices for, 215; education by the orders, 215, 256; budget under MacMahon, 283; faculties of theology closed, 286; catechism taught in common schools, 317; catechism expelled from common schools, 317; monopoly of liberty, 314.
- Catholics, speak of "Catholic France," 177, 282; many nominal, 177; have converts from free-thought, 185; emancipation of some of their priests, 186; never had a better clergy, 186; importance of laymen, 188; controlled France under MacMahon, 213, 313; intolerance against non-Catholics, 284; opposed to reforms, 287; liberty of, 308; using Law of Separation, 329; popular antagonism against, 314.
- Cereals, 42.
- Challenel-Lacour, 8.
- Chamber of commerce, better organized, 56; founded in other countries, *ibid.*
- Chambord, Comte de, 3.
- Chambrun, Count de, 83.
- Charity, new meaning, 155.
- Chartreuse, distilling of, 258.
- Châteaux, protected, 97.
- Chauchard, gift of 40 millions, 83.
- Chemistry, 129.
- Children, homes for, 148; *garderies* of, 150.
- Christianity, in philanthropy, 155; at one with free-thought, 167; French ethics friendly to, 172.
- Civil service, 2, 15, 70.
- Clemenceau, senator, 8; created ministry of labour, 137; formula of life, 172.

- Clergy, priest emancipated from Concordat, 19; priest's place taken by teacher, 85; priest only a priest now, 177; priest has lost secular power, 178; political defeats of, 178; best France ever had, 186; priests in the mission field, 187; popular antagonism to, 281; ever has grievances, 282; earnestness of priests, 252; monopoly of burials, 288; "priest enemy of his country," 314, 315; subjected by Concordat, 325.
- Coal, white, *houille blanche*, 47; extracted, 48; used, 191.
- Collège de France*, 104.
- Colonies, increase of, 35; continuity of purpose in colonial expansion in Africa, 35; development of railroads in, 35; capital invested in, 36; increase of trade in, 37; Archibald, J. F. J., on French, 38; reacting upon France, 39; organisations to help, 39.
- Combes, 8, 275, 276; anti-monastic work, 277, 287; clericals not helped by overthrow of, 292; leader of the Bloc, 319.
- Commerce, development of, 56, 59; creation of Superior Council of, 56; creation of Ministry of, 56; organisation of councillors of Foreign Trade, 57; organisation of *attachés commerciaux*, 57; organisation of societies of commercial geography, 57; foundation of Commercial Institute of Paris, 57; commercial journalism, 58; influence of economic studies, 58.
- Commission de l'inventaire général des richesses d'art de la France*, 96.
- Commune, 1, 2.
- Comte, 106.
- Concordat, 19, 257, 263; disregard of by Vatican, 288; Gallican agreement, 265; other concordats, 296, 307; a *discordat*, 311; not observed by Vatican, 312; nature of, 324; annoyances to the clergy from the, 327; Napoleon not restorer of worship, 340.
- Congresses, international, 29; National Pedagogic, 86; meetings of the *Association française pour l'avancement des sciences*, 125.
- Conseils académiques*, 87.
- Conservatives, inability to defend their cause, 13.
- Constitution, 5.
- Convicts, aims of laws toward, 24.
- Co-operative, associations, agricultural, 46; societies, 139.
- Cotton culture in Africa, 40.
- Councils, general, 13.
- Crime, 156, 162; increase among soldiers, 163; increase of juvenile, 164; juvenile crime under former régimes, 164; schools not responsible for, 165; agencies to oppose, 165.
- Criticism, 92.
- Culture, intellectual, 199; physical, 200.
- Curie, Mme., 23, 130, 134.
- Darwin, overthrow of the ethics of evolution, 171.
- Debt, excuse for national, 69; increase of, 71; debt owned by Frenchmen, 73.
- Decentralisation, 14; educational, 85.
- Degrees, granting of, 286.
- Delcassé, labours of, 27; policy continued by M. Pichon, 28; sacrificed to placate Germany, 28; anti-clerical, 281; lenient with liberal bishops, 291; closed embassy to the Vatican, 291, 312.
- Delphi, 118.
- Demolins, *A quoi tient la supériorité des Anglo-Saxons?*, 113.
- Denominations, freedom of, 19.

- Deputies, Chamber of, 10;
causes of its character, 11;
not hostile to religion, 12;
anti-clerical group, 281.
- Deschamps, Gaston, 85, 92.
- Deschanel, Emile, 8, 265.
- Deschanel, Paul, orator, 94;
what Republic has done for
workingman, 138; formula of
life, 172.
- Didon, 174, 175, 176, 253, 254.
- Divorces, 156; statistics, 157.
- Drama, 92; interpretation of,
102; philosophical intelligence
in, 112.
- Dress, universally improved, 193;
cheaper raw material, 193.
- Dreyfus case, 24, 31, 259.
- Du Lac, 78, 253, 259, 260.
- Dupanloup, Bishop, 8, 11; op-
posed law of religious liberty
for all, 286.
- Dutuit, artistic collection, 83.
- Economic individualism, 48;
economic studies and com-
merce, 58.
- Economists, 115.
- Education, budget for, and agri-
culture, 1870 and 1910, 46, 69;
new educational buildings, 74;
school and life, 78; co-opera-
tion of cities with the State, 81;
new educational institutions,
82; new museums as instru-
ments of, 83; high moral
character of teachers, 85;
unions of teachers, 86; feder-
ation of educational societies,
ibid.; Catholic, 89; criticisms
of Catholics useful, 216;
primary, number of pupils,
75; number of teachers, *ibid.*;
elements taught, 76; more
practical, 77; associations of
pupils, 89; teaching of his-
tory in, 120; raised general
education, 198; high morality
of teachers, 216; secondary
transformation of, 78; num-
ber of pupils, 78; teaching of
philosophy, 105; teaching of
history, 120; university work,
80; increase in number of
chairs, *ibid.*; increase in num-
ber of students, *ibid.*; increase
in number of doctor's degrees,
ibid.; revival of old univer-
sities, 84.
- Educator, greater freedom, 85;
union of teachers and educa-
tors, 86; *conférences pédago-
giques*, teachers' conventions,
86; judged by his peers, 87;
prominent educators, *ibid.*;
voluntarism of teachers, 89.
- Electricity, transmission of ener-
gy, 47; lighting of London
Exhibition, 51; working pow-
er looms at home, 52.
- Empire, Second, abuse of power,
15; *candidatures officielles*, 16;
restraints upon the press, 20;
restraints upon circulation of
books, pamphlets, 21; re-
straints upon travel, 21; spy-
ing in hotels, 21; workingman
prevented from going to Paris,
22; isolated France, 25; igno-
rance of some army officers, 30.
- Engineering, great works of, 50;
schools of, 53.
- England, French metallic works
for, 51; and France, 25; *en-
tente*, 27.
- Equality. No distinction be-
tween rich and poor in schools,
75.
- Estournelles de Constant, d', 8.
- Ethnographers, errors of, 17.
- Exhibitions, in Paris, 29; agents
of industrial progress, 55.
- Fallières, G.
- Farming implements, 43.
- Faure, G; self-made man, 207.
- Federation of Societies against
Pornography, 166.
- Fédération des amicales d'institu-
teurs*, 86.
- Ferry, Jules, 6, 37, 79, 220,
264.
- Fiction, 94; more philosophical
intelligence in, 112.

- Finances. Reports of Bank of France, 59; annual income from securities, 60; foreign investments, 61; French foreign investments under the Empire, 62; French annual receipts from other countries, 62; stock of gold, 63; advance of railroad securities, 63; expenses for army, 69; expenses for former armaments, 69.
- Finances of the Republic, criticisms of Reactionaries, 68; increase of national debt, 72; decrease of rates of interest, 72; reasons for national credit, 72.
- Fine Arts, 96; art in schools, 76; care of artistic monuments, 97; sculpture, 99; French art in other countries, 99; decorative arts, 101; popularisation of, 102.
- Food, more varied, 191; abundant, 192; cheaper, 192.
- Forests, 58.
- Fouillée, 107, 133, 164, 172.
- France, Greater, 36.
- France. International relations, 25; conciliatory policy, 27; treaties of arbitration, 27; and Russia, 27; at the Conference of Brussels, 28; at the Conference of Berlin, 28.
- Franco-Prussian War, and education, 74; caused large expenses, 69.
- Freedom of meetings, law, 16; of press law, 16; of trade-unions laws, 16; of association law, 17, 270; of literature, 21; increased for Catholics, 19; increased for educators, 185; increased for philosophers, 103; increased for historians, 116; increased for scientists, 127.
- Free-masons, 266, 280.
- Free-thinkers, 167, 271, 280; prevented from opening schools, 313.
- French Academy, 93, 95, 154.
- French architects, work in Paris, 98; work abroad, 100.
- French artists, 99; abroad, 100.
- French Revolution, horrors of, 4; political liberalism of, 12; clerical privileges lost since, 283; orders before the, 252; unfairness of orders for, 256.
- Frenchmen, offer of 40 billions, 2; growing love of sea, 34; conscious of their economic position in the world, 55; have not economic advantages of Americans, 58; mostly owners of national debt, 73; philosophy deepening thinking of, 112; travel more, 194; discovery of their own country, 196; nationally broader, 196; influenced by other nations, 197; travel abroad, 197; knowledge of foreign languages, 198; better educated, 198; better read, 198; larger culture, 199; larger size, 201; greater longevity, 201; have faith in power of schools, 212; their suspicion of monasticism, 261.
- Freycinet, 8.
- Functionaries, increase in number, 70; justification of that increase, 70.
- Gallican, theological professors contemplated in Concordat, 257, 265; liberties gone, 185.
- Gallieni, as explorer, 33.
- Gambetta, 9, 11, 94; voiced national feelings, 285.
- Gardens, colonial, 39.
- Gayraud, Abbé, Catholic charities, 148; weakness of the faith of Catholics, 176; anti-clericalism of pupils of the orders, 266; defended casuistry in parliament, 225; electoral body anti-clerical, 281; "neutrality of schools contrary to Christian faith," 306; majority of voters want justice and equality, 308; liberty condemned by popes, 309.

- Germans, 1.
 Germany, war indemnity to, 2;
 and France, 26; and Morocco,
 28; Delcassé did not isolate,
 28; Delcassé sacrificed to pla-
 cate, 28.
 Gibbons, Cardinal, and French
 schools, 235; ascribes words
 to Briand which he never ut-
 tered, 235; makes Concordat
 a matrimony between Church
 and State, 311.
 Gide, 114.
 Gifts, large, Chauchard, 83; Du-
 tuit, *ibid.*; Broca, *ibid.*; Count
 de Chambrun, *ibid.*; Guimet,
 84; Aumale, Duc d', Chantilly,
 97; Siegfried, Langeais, 97;
Prix Osiris, 126; Osiris's to
 Pasteur Institute, 126; Kahn,
 Albert, 126; annual to institu-
 tions, 148.
 God, existence or non-existence,
 111; conceptions of, 179, 182;
 refusal to oath in name of, 172;
 practical value in ethics, 182;
 attempts to eliminate word
 from text-books, 226, 241,
 242; in Ferry's programme of
 instruction, 227; most text-
 books teach existence of, 227,
 243, 245, 247; duties toward,
 237, 238, 244, 248, 249; Higher
 Power, 240; the universe
 and, 250.
 Godin, profit sharing, 139.
 Gosse, Edmund, France not de-
 clining, 211.
 Grévy, 6.
 Guimet Museum of religions, 84,
 180.
 Guyot, Yves, 115.
 Hanotaux, 2, 3.
 Haussonville père, 8.
 Health, sanitation, 145; those
 professionally looking after,
 200; physical culture, 200.
 Hebrews, 189; their pulpits, 95;
 marriages with the nobility,
 208; compelled to attend
 church, 284.
 History, freedom of investiga-
 tors, 116; helps to historians,
 117; accumulation of mate-
 rials, 117; excavations, 118;
 schools of in other countries,
 118; objectivity of, 119; his-
 torical reviews, 121.
 Homes for labourers, 144; asso-
 ciated homes, 145; the aged,
 148; more and larger, 190;
 lighting and warming, 191.
 Housing the people, 144.
Houille blanche, 47.
 Hyacinth, Père, prevented from
 lecturing in Paris, 314.
 Hydrophobia, 131.
 Illiterate, 75.
 Immortality, 229, 240.
 Imperialists, prospects in 1871-3.
 Industrial schools, 54.
 Industries, uses of water-power,
 47; number of persons con-
 nected with, 47; comparative
 progress, 48; number of pa-
 tents, 49; industrial agglomera-
 tions, 49; metallurgic works,
 50; textile, 52; technical
 schools, 53; exhibitions, 55.
 Infants, protection of, 147; dim-
 inution of deaths of, 201.
 Insane, 156, 161.
 Insurance, life, 143.
 Interest, rates since 1870, 59;
 interest on national debt paid
 to Frenchmen, 73.
 Inventors, more numerous, 49;
 increase in the number of pa-
 tents, 49.
 Iron, comparative production,
 48; large structures, 50.
 Janet, Paul, 104, 105.
 Jauréguiberry, 8.
 Jaurès, 94.
 Jesuits, 259, 263, 265; expulsion
 of, 286, 316.
 Jesus, influence of his teachings,
 155; and French ethics, 172;
 name avoided by some writers
 of moral text-books, 228;
 Kingdom of, 260.

- Jewelry, export of, 52.
- Judiciary, greater independence of, 24; leniency, 162; juvenile courts, 138; courts fair with Catholics, 305.
- Laboratories for agriculture, 44; education, 84; in Paris and provinces, 122; for working-men, 153.
- Laboulaye, 8.
- Labour-unions and suffrage, 16; organisation of unions, 138, 204; unions like other organisations, 205; unions not revolutionary, 206; exchanges, 136; creation of Ministry of, 137; legislation, 137; employment bureaux, 139; profit sharing, 139; old-age pensions, 141; new conception of, 141; food of labourer, 192; wages of, 193.
- Lamarck, 128.
- Lamazelle, de, 8.
- Land. More fertile, 42; in the south winter garden of France and England, 43; better distributed, 46, 65.
- Lapparent, 133.
- Lavisie, orator, 95; historian, 119, 214.
- Laws. Deputies take initiative of new, 10; of freedom to hold meetings, 16; of freedom of the press, 16; of freedom of trades-unions, 16; of freedom of association, 17, 19, 270; of freedom to circulate books, pamphlets, 21; of freedom to open saloons, 21; limiting absolute parental authority, 21; limiting parental authority over the marriages of their children, 22; taking away children from vicious parents, 22; protecting women, 22; allowing women to be witnesses, 23; allowing divorce, 23; giving a better chance to the accused, 23; granting counsel to the poor in civil cases, 23; easier revision of criminal cases, 24; principles of these, 24; of the Republic empirical, 24; Bérenger Law of probation, 25; of liability of employers, 137; providing inspectors of mines, 137; freeing workmen from the *livret*, 137; regulating child labour in factories, 137; of arbitration between employers and employees, 137; of Sunday rest, 137; of association, 270; preventing orders from teaching, 276; of Separation, 293.
- Lectures, popular, 89; under the Empire, 153.
- Legacies, 64.
- Legislation, social, 22; liberalising of, 23; changes in principles of, 24.
- Legitimists, prospects in 1871, 3.
- Lemaitre, 92.
- Leroy-Beaulieu, Paul, 115.
- Leroy-Beaulieu, Pierre, statement concerning wide distribution of stocks of Bank of France, 67.
- Liberty, for all, 16; for all religious bodies, 19; of Catholics, 308; Catholic monopoly of, 314.
- Libraries. Large place to history, 102; of labour-unions, 139.
- Life, new, 190.
- Ligue de l'éducation physique*, 201.
- Ligue de l'enseignement*, 86.
- Lipmann, 128, 134.
- Literature, freedom of, 21; changes in, 91.
- Literary criticism, 92.
- Litré, 8.
- Livret*, note, 22, 37, 137.
- Loi de sûreté générale*, 15.
- Loubet, 6; visit to Rome, 290, 312.
- Lycées*, 74; new spirit in, 78; new curricula, 79.
- Lyon, G., 108, 182.

- Machinery, use of in agriculture, 43; in industries, 49.
- MacMahon, under, 283, 286; president, 6; and persecution of non-Catholics, 265.
- Madagascar, soldiers teaching arts of peace, 32.
- Meetings, freedom to hold, 16.
- Méline, S.
- Mercère, de, 8.
- Mines, 58.
- Ministries, enlargements of, 6; continuity of purpose of, 7; greater steadiness of, 7; creation of a Ministry of Agriculture, 44; creation of a Ministry of Commerce, 56; creation of a Ministry of Labour, 137.
- Missions, priests in the field, 187, protectorate of, 255; Protestant, 356; rendered services to science, 125.
- Mistral, founder of Arlesian Museum, 84.
- Moissan, 129, 134.
- Monod, Gabriel, 119, 357.
- Monuments, restoration of, 97.
- Moral education, 218.
- Moral instruction, in schools, 76; 212; planned by competent men, 219; helped by well-known writers, 219; method of, 220; Jules Ferry programme, 220; text-books, 221; character of, 224; religious aspect of, 226; results, 231; extracts from text-books of morals, 235; catechism taught, 317; in Catholic schools, 330.
- Morals, moral purpose in the drama, 92; growth of altruism, 155; Superior School of, 165; Society against Pornography, 166; *Société des droits l'homme*, 166; protection of animals, 167; growing sense of the importance of, 168; less chauvinistic, 168; idea of moral progress, 170; away from Darwinian ethics, 171; larger sense of the word *duty*, 172.
- Morocco, Germany and, 28; soldiers pioneers, 32; for the Moroccans, 169.
- Mun, de, political orator, 94; Catholic clubs, 153; noble manhood of, 209; defense of orders, 268; Catholic deputy, 281.
- Museums, new, 83.
- Music, 101.
- Mutual-aid societies, 141.
- Napoleon III, progress under, vi; *candidatures officielles*, 16; schools under, 87; forbade teaching of philosophy, 104; found money for opera but not for laboratories, 123; closed institutions of unauthorised orders, 263; abused by clergy, 265.
- Navy, 33.
- Newfoundland, 27.
- Neymarck, estimates of investments abroad, 62; estimates of ownership by the people of stocks and bonds, 67.
- Nobel prize, 93.
- Nobility, no longer so much contempt for work, 208.
- Nordau, Max, France not declining, 210.
- Orders, dispersion of, 252, 277; Concordat did not contemplate their presence, 252, 312; Monks make surrender of self, 254; zeal of, 255; and education, 256; character of their education, 256; seizing theological teaching, 257; becoming revivalists, 257; becoming distillers, 258, 266; becoming patent-medicine makers, 258; unfriendly to government, 260; a unit against Dreyfus, 261; Frenchmen suspicious of, 261; disregard of law, 262; own pupils often worst opponents, 265; skilful in handling money, 267; used dummies, 267; Catholic French kings

- opposed them, 270; significance of Association Law, 271; justification of Association Law, 272; settlement of property, 274; prevented from teaching, 276; monastic problem not settled, 278; teaching monastics compelled like common school teachers to have diplomas, 286, 316; compelled to pay inheritance tax, 286, 316.
- Organic Articles, 19, 252.
- Organisations, few under Empire, 17; increase of number, 18.
- Orleanists, prospects in 1871, 3.
- Palais scolaires*, 74.
- Paris, Comte de, character of, 3.
- Paris, peculiar municipal government, 14; exhibitions in, 55; new museums, 83; new edifices, 97; prizes to those erecting finest houses, 98; under the Empire and now, 98.
- Parliament and education, 75; alcoholism, 161; respect of Trouillot for religion, 269; respect of Waldeck-Rousseau for religion, 269.
- Pasteur and laboratories, 121; admiration for what had been done, 122, 212; laments Napoleon's indifference for laboratories, 123; his work, 131.
- Patents, increase in number, 49.
- Pensions, old-age, 141; given by government, 142; given by employers, 142.
- Petite église*, its rise, 326.
- Petroleum, 191.
- Philanthropy, 136; *La Fourmi*, 140; homes for workingmen, 144; homes for single women, 145; work against tuberculosis, 146; Pasteur Institute, 146; work for babies, 147; work for old people and helpless, 148; work of Catholics, 149; orphanages, 149; *crèches*, 149; *garderies* of children, 150; *cantines scolaires*, 150; abandoned children, 150; white slaves, 151; women without work, 151; for mothers, 151; for wounded soldiers, 152; evidence of, 154; spirit of, 155.
- Philosophy, freedom of, 103; teaching of, 104; greater freedom of teacher of, 105; in the Catholic schools, 106; periodicals devoted to, 110; schools of, 111; influence upon literature, 112; force of order, 113; new view of matter, 171; prominence of religious problems in, 181.
- Poetry, 93; philosophical intelligence in, 112.
- Poincaré, Henri, 128, 134.
- Pope, temporal power of, 26; and Separation, 296; petition of French Catholics to, 298; rejecting Separation Law, 307, 327; and the visit to Rome of President Loubet, 290, 312; power in France limited by Concordat, 324; not limited now, 326; défiant of Republic, 329.
- Postal service, increase of, 41; decrease of rates, 71.
- Prefects, 14.
- Presidents, 5; under clergy, 283.
- Press, liberty of, 16; restraints under Empire, 20; development of, 20, 199; educational work of some reviews, 89.
- Pressensé, Edmond de, 8.
- Prix littéraire de Rome*, 96.
- Prizes, literary, 95; Paris prizes to those erecting finest houses, 98; science, 126, 134; *prix de la vertu*, 154.
- Procès des Treize*, 15.
- Profit sharing, 139.
- Protestant pictures of religious conditions, 174; national synod, 175.
- Protestantism, French, its relations to Catholicism, 333.
- Puvis de Chavannes, 100.

- Quatrefages, de, 133.
- Railroads in the colonies, 35; in France, 40; increase, 41; advance of railroad securities, 63; earnings, 64; to become property of the State, 73; greater travel on, 194; increased transportation of freight, 195.
- Ranc, senator, 8; condemned under the Empire, 18.
- Reactionaries, 68, 213.
- Reinach, Joseph, 160, 161.
- Religion, union of Free-thinkers and Free-believers, 166; under the Empire, 174; at beginning of the Republic, 175; intellectual interest in, 179; religious inquiry in institutions, 180.
- Religious, faith, decline under the Empire, 174; loss of faith, 175, 176; real losses, 177; respect of Trouillot for, 269; estrangement of masses, 314.
- Renan, 73, 95, 228, 275.
- Renouvier, 106, 171.
- Republic, foundation of, 1; early prospects of, 5; its credit, 72; stability of this credit, 73; recognises birthright of child to education, 75; man counts for more in, 206; definition of, 313.
- Republican rule a necessity, 5.
- Republicans, outlook after Franco-Prussian war, 4; secured maximum of liberty for all, 17.
- Ribot, Alexandre, senator, 8, 270.
- Ribot, Théodule, psychologist, 109.
- Richepin idealising sea-faring life, 34.
- Roads and highways, 41; helps to agriculture, 45.
- Rod, 92, 94.
- Rodin, 99.
- Rostand, 92.
- Rouvier, 8.
- Russia, French investments in, 61; alliance, 27; better relations between England and, 28; French colonies like those of, 34.
- Sabatier, A., 109.
- Sabatier, Armand, 132.
- Sabatier, Paul, 13, 235.
- Sainte-Beuve, 92.
- Salons, 96.
- Saloons, 21.
- Sanitation, 145.
- Sardou, 92.
- Savings-banks, 66, 139; educate the people, 67.
- Say, Léon, estimate of French investments abroad under the Empire, 62.
- Scherer, 8, 92.
- School mutual-aid societies, 141.
- Schools, colonial, 39; agricultural, 44; industrial, 53; commercial, 58; number of primary, 75; of design and decorative arts, 77; unsectarian not godless, 77, 227; for women, 79; not responsible for increase of juvenile crime, 165.
- Science, sciences in secondary schools, 77; laboratories, 121; observatories, 123; periodicals, 124; societies, 125; gifts for advancement of, 126; idealism of F., 127; prominence of, 134.
- Scientists, honors to, 134; moderate anti-clericals, 280.
- Sculpture, 99.
- Securities, advance in the securities of French railroads, 63.
- Sedan, 74.
- Seignobos, 3.
- Senate, its distinguished members, 8; its character, 9; senators former deputies, 9.
- Separation, Law of, 13, 280; principles discussed in early days of the Republic, 291; Bill of, 292; discussed in parliament, 292; voted, 293; analysis of the Law of, 293; protest of the Pope, 296; Law more liberal than could

- be expected, 297; Protestants and Hebrews accepted it, 298; reasonableness of the Law of, 299; church boards, 300; more liberal than those of Prussia, 301; salary of clergy, 301; confiscation of property, 303; Catholic judicial objections, 304.
- Sèvres, superior normal school for women, 80.
- Sévrienne, 80.
- Shakespeare, 102.
- Siegfried, 8.
- Simon, Jules, 8, 11, 265.
- Social reform, 136; improvement, 155; the hard school, 155; dealing with convicts, 165; School of High Social Studies, 165; changed conditions, 203.
- Socialists and teachers, 86; internationalism of, 224.
- Société d'économie politique* of Paris, 71.
- Société historique*, 119.
- Société pour la protection des paysages de France*, 196.
- Societies, colonial, 39; commercial geography, 57; educational, 86, 88; scientific, 125; co-operative, 139; mutual-aid, 140; to encourage travel, 195; medical and surgical, 200; socialisation in every realm, 204; labour-unions, 204.
- Societies, danger from large associations, 205; labour-unions not revolutionary, 206.
- Sociologists, 113.
- Spencer, 106.
- Steam engines, comparative numbers and power of, 49; per inhabitant, 194.
- Suicides, 156.
- Superior Council of Public Instruction, 87; bishops dismissed from, 316.
- Superstitions of cattle raisers, 42.
- Taine, 119, 265.
- Tarde, 114, 164.
- Taxes, 71; to make up for services formerly paid but now free, 71; distributed more equitably, 71; increased proportionally to wealth, 71.
- Telegraph, 41.
- Telephone, 41.
- Textile fabrics, more artistic, 52.
- Théry, Edmond, estimates of financial transactions, 60; French investments abroad, 62; editor, 115.
- Thiers, 6, 11, 169.
- Timbuctoo, 36.
- Towns, increased freedom of, 14.
- Trade, in the colonies, 36; Foreign Trade Office, 56; counsellors of, 56.
- Trades-unions, freedom of, 16; favoured by government, 137; organisation of, 138; parts of a larger movement, 204; unrest of, 205; not revolutionary, 206.
- Travel, freedom of, 22; increase of, 194; helped by organisations, 195; revealed attractiveness of France, 196.
- Trouillot, Georges, senator, 8; chairman of parliamentary commission on Law of Association, 266; quoting from *Theologica dogmatica et moralis*, 268.
- Ultramontane, rule, 272; régime gradually introduced, 288; against liberal bishops, 290; Concordat not, 312.
- Ultramontanes say that growth of orders sign of progress, 186.
- Vatican, and the Concordat, 288, 291; spiritual autocracy of, 185; and the *nobis* controversy, 289; and the Loubet visit to Rome, 290; closing embassy to, 291; Separation hastened by acts of, 292; protestation against Law of Separation, 296; objects to church boards, 300.

- Veuillot, Louis, formula of Catholic action in reference to liberty, 310.
 Vineyards, 42.
 Wages, increased, 193; buying power of, 193.
 Waldeck-Rousseau, 19, 266; quoting Hugo, 270; property of orders, 274; abused, 275; anti-clericalism of, 276.
 War opposed, 169.
 Washburne, E. B., 2.
 Water-powers, discovery of, 47.
 Wealth, nation's, 63; earnings of railroads, 64; increase of legacies, 64; gauged by assessor's lists, 64; gauged by increased legacies, 65; better distribution of, 65; shown also by savings-banks, 66; owning of railroad security by the people, 67.
 Weaving, electric, 52.
 Wendell, Barrett, on religion in *lycées*, 236; friend's opinion of orders, 262.
 Women, laws concerning them, 22; voting in some cases, 22; able now to be witnesses, 22; highest positions accessible to them, 22; right to more equitable share of husband's estate, 23; right to her own wages, 23; may have divorce, 23; secondary schools for, 79; attendance of these schools, 80; protection of girls and mothers, 151; work of, 152.
 Workmen, and Napoleon III, 3; proportion of connected with industries, 47; greater freedom, 137; helped by legislation, 137; by labour-unions, 138; profit sharing, 139; mutual-aid societies, 140; old-age pensions, 142; annuities, 143.
 Wurtz, 8.
 Zola, 94.